DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 112 EA 026 797

AUTHOR	Bull, Barry; And Others
TITLE	Professional Development and Teacher Time: Principles, Guidelines, and Policy Options for Indiana.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Education Policy Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Indiana State Dept. of Education, Indianapolis.
PUB DATE	Nov 94
NOTE	103p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Inservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development; Program Effectiveness; State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Improvement; *Time Management
IDENTIFIERS	*Indiana

ABSTRACT

The most frequent form of professional development for teachers--occasional workshops conducted by outside consultants--is widely regarded as ineffective. This document presents findings of a study, conducted by the Indiana Education Policy Center School of Education Office, to examine professional development and its connection to teacher time. Findings indicate that states differ in their approaches to providing time for teachers' professional development. Effective professional development is school-based, uses coaching and other followup procedures, is collaborative, is embedded in teachers' daily lives, and focuses on student learning. Four factors of professional-development initiatives include leadership, resource and policy support, norms of collegiality and experimentation, and adequate time. Nine guidelines for defining the purpose, scheduling, allocation, and use of teacher time are outlined. Options for a system of teacher professional-development time and the components of an ideal system are also described. The final chapter considers several aspects of state policy, including how basic policies might create a reservoir of teacher-development time at each school, how that time might be funded, how the system might be regulated, and how supporting resources might be provided. Four tables are included. The appendix summarizes state-level professional-development policies in Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Florida, Georgia, and Washington. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

0007

ED 384 112

Professional Development and Teacher Time: Principles, Guidelines, and Policy Options for Indiana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. McCarthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 024 747

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professional Development and Teacher Time: Principles, Guidelines, and Policy Options for Indiana

This report was prepared for the
Indiana Department of Education

by the

Indiana Education Policy Center
School of Education Office
Indiana University

The report was authored by

Barry Bull
Mark Buechler
Steve Didley
Lee Krehbiel

This publication is based on work sponsored by the Department of Education/State of Indiana under a personal services contract. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Education or any other agency of the State of Indiana.

November 1994

Contents

Acknowledgements v

Executive Summary vii

Chapter

1 Professional Development: Definition, Rationale, and Current Practice 1
2 State-Level Professional Development Policies in Indiana and Selected States 9
3 Principles of Effective Professional Development 19
4 Guidelines for State Policy on Teacher Time for Professional Development 41
5 Assessing Indiana's Policy Options for Teacher Professional Development Time 49

References 69

Appendix

Summaries of State-Level Professional Development Policies in Selected States 75
Appendix References 93

Tables

2.1 Local Contract Provisions for Professional Development Days in Indiana 10
2.2 Teacher Days, Instructional Days, and Professional Development Days in Indiana and Seven Other States 15
3.1 Effect Sizes for Training Outcomes by Training Components 24
5.1 Estimated Costs of Professional Development Time Options 54

Acknowledgements

First, we would like to thank Suellen Reed, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for commissioning this report. As professional development rises to the top of the education policy agenda in states across the nation, policymakers need as much information as possible to make informed decisions. Dr. Reed is to be commended for this and other attempts to bring the results of research on professional development to the attention of policymakers in Indiana.

We would also like to thank three professional development experts--Michael Fullan, Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto; Susan Loucks-Horsley, Senior Associate, The NETWORK, Inc., and the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands; and Dennis Sparks, Executive Director, National Staff Development Council--for participating in a 90-minute conference call to discuss an earlier draft of this report. Also present for this call were officials from various state agencies in Indiana: Steve Heck, Director, Indiana Principal Leadership Academy; Marilyn Scannell, Director, Professional Standards Board; Phyllis Land Usher, Senior Officer, Center for School Improvement, Indiana Department of Education (IDOE); David Wilkinson, Re:Learning Coordinator, IDOE; and Jeff Zaring, State Board of Education Administrator. All these individuals helped clarify our thinking about professional development issues and offered excellent suggestions for improving the report.

We are grateful to the Indiana School Boards Association and the Indiana Federation of Teachers for providing information on various professional development activities in Indiana. Likewise, we thank officials at state agencies in Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Washington for the information they provided on professional development policies and programs in their respective states.

Finally, we would like to thank staff members of the Indiana Education Policy Center School of Education Office who contributed to the report. Administrative assistant Rebecca Hubbert, research associates Jim Arnold and Anthony Rolle, and publications director Bob Baird helped proofread the final copy. Faculty researchers Bob Arnove and Martha McCarthy read a draft of the report and provided constructive suggestions for improvement. And a special thanks to Gayle Hall, associate director, who drafted the proposal for this project, supervised the gathering of information on policies and programs in Indiana and other states, and contributed invaluable advice every step of the way.

Executive Summary

Five years ago, President Bush and the nation's governors formulated a set of six education goals for America. When President Clinton signed the Goals 2000 Act earlier this year, two new goals had been added. One focused on parental involvement. The other addressed professional development for teachers:

> By the year 2000, the Nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills . . . needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century. (Goals 2000: Educate America Act §102, 1994)

This addition to the national goals reflects a growing consensus among educators, researchers, and policymakers that it is futile to call for profound changes in America's schools without giving practicing teachers the opportunities for professional growth they need to bring those changes about.

Unfortunately, the form that professional development for teachers has most often taken--occasional workshops conducted by outside consultants with little or no follow-up--is widely regarded as ineffective. It is unlikely that this kind of training will serve as the lever that helps transform education in America. As Richard Wallace and his colleagues have written, "We need staff development that is dramatically different, not just in content, but in form of delivery and level of commitment" (Wallace, LeMahieu, & Bickel, 1990, p. 185).

What might effective professional development for 21st century schooling look like? How can schools make time available for professional development when teachers are also being called upon to increase student contact hours?

To help answer these questions for the state of Indiana, the Indiana Education Policy Center School of Education Office, under contract with the Indiana Department of Education, conducted a study of professional development and its connection to teacher time. Our charge was to describe state-level policies on professional development in Indiana and other states, distill a set of principles for effective professional development from the research literature, generate a set of guidelines for state professional development policy in Indiana, and present and analyze policy options for making teacher time available for professional development in Indiana.

Current Professional Development Practices

Opportunities for professional development are in no short supply around the country. Federal dollars fund many programs; state departments of education offer a variety of workshops on mandates and innovations to schools; school districts have

access to an array of professional development programs offered by an army of consultants; there are professional development schools, teacher centers, programs provided by professional organizations, and so forth.

It is possible to give some idea of the organization, implementation, cost, and benefits of professional development on the state and local level by summarizing a large-scale study of professional development in California (Little, Gerritz, Stern, Guthrie, Kirst, & Marsh, 1987). Among their conclusions:

- Professional development programs for teachers and administrators (excluding graduate courses) consume about 1.8% of the state's education funds.
- For every dollar spent on professional development, teachers contribute 60 cents in uncompensated time.
- Most professional development activities are designed and administered by district personnel.
- Professional development resources are used in ways that generally reinforce traditional teaching methods and school structures.
- Rarely is professional development evaluated in terms of its effects on teachers or students.
- California lacks a comprehensive or consistent policy for professional development.

There were some positive findings as well, but on the whole, Little et al. describe a situation in which a good deal of money and effort was being expended on professional development, with little evidence of significant changes in student learning, teachers' behavior, or school organization.

It is beyond the scope of our study to investigate professional development activities in such detail. We did, however, examine state-level professional development policies, programs, and trends (excluding certification and licensing requirements) in Indiana and seven other states: the four bordering states (Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio) and three other states with a national reputation for professional development policy (Florida, Georgia, and Washington).

State-Level Professional Development Policies

The states we studied take three different approaches toward providing teacher time for professional development in their definitions of the school year. Three states--Indiana, Michigan, and Washington--make no provision for teacher professional development time in the state-defined school year. (Both Michigan and Washington, however, do provide additional funds to be used for professional development.) Two states--Illinois and Ohio--allow school districts to use some of the mandated school days for professional development instead of student instruction. A third group--Kentucky, Florida, and Georgia--include within the school year non-instructional days that may or must be used for professional development.

State professional development policies vary in other ways as well. For example:

- Some states link their professional development requirements and opportunities to state reform goals or to mandated school improvement plans. Others do not.

- States provide funds for professional development by means of a formula based on the number of students served, by mandating that a particular share of local budgets be spent on professional development, or by operating a grant program for which schools or school districts must apply.

With some sense of alternative state policies, we turn next to the research literature on effective professional development, which can also be an important guide to the policy options for Indiana.

Overview: Professional Development and School Improvement

Despite a lack of direct evidence that links certain types of professional development to improvements in teaching and student learning, a relatively firm consensus has emerged among experts regarding the principles underlying effective professional development. One thing that virtually everyone agrees on is that one-shot workshops for teachers are generally ineffective. Instead of occasional, fragmented workshops, professional development activities need to include sustained training for teachers, with opportunities for observation, practice, feedback, and coaching.

However, skills training for individual teachers, no matter how well designed, may not be enough to further the sweeping innovations that need to take place in schools, according to many experts. What is required goes beyond skills training to *organizational development,* which involves not just changes in individual teachers' abilities but also "improvements in the capacity of the organization to solve problems and renew itself" (Sparks, 1994, p. 42). This means focusing on formal school structures and processes (e.g., governance, policies, channels for communication) and, perhaps more importantly, on school culture--the norms, values, and beliefs that underlie formal operations and infuse the lives of administrators, teachers, and students with meaning. It means "introducing the notion of life-long learning into our institutions, and making that goal a central factor in their organization, routines, and accountability structure" ("Making Staff," 1991, p. 4). Ultimately, it means transforming schools into centers of continuous learning for teachers and students alike.

Five Principles of Effective Professional Development

Five general principles for effective professional development emerge from this view of overall school improvement:

- *Effective professional development is school based.* The school is the basic unit of lasting change. It may be advisable, therefore, to shift from generic, district-level professional development initiatives to site-specific, school-based ones. That way, a school-based professional development plan can be part of an overall school improvement plan (the formulation of which can also be considered a form of professional development). One of the advantages of this approach is that it gets teachers involved in the design and implementation of their own professional development activities, which can be essential to the success of those activities.

- *Effective professional development uses coaching and other follow-up procedures.* Single training sessions with no follow-up are ineffective. Activities that deploy sessions spaced over time have better results, particularly if those sessions include presentations of theory, demonstrations of new teaching skills, and opportunities for teachers to practice and receive feedback. If training is to have any lasting effect on teachers' behavior in the classroom, however, follow-up procedures, especially coaching, are critical. There are two main types of coaching: (1) coaching by experts and (2) coaching by peers, or giving teachers the opportunity to observe one another and provide feedback and support. Giving teachers structured time to discuss new concepts and experiences also can enhance the effectiveness of training.
- *Effective professional development is collaborative.* Most schools are organized in ways that isolate teachers from their peers. However, professional development, like school improvement in general, works best as a collaborative endeavor. Each school needs to become a *community* in which teachers routinely have opportunities to participate in decision making, observe each other, identify and solve problems together, and share ideas in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Teachers can also benefit from collaboration that extends beyond the boundaries of schools. Collegial networks such as the National Writing Project enable groups of teachers from across the district, state, or nation to join together in developing, implementing, and discussing new approaches.
- *Effective professional development is embedded in the daily lives of teachers, providing for continuous growth.* At present, professional development is a patchwork affair: an inservice day here, an occasional workshop there. If school improvement is to succeed, the patchwork nature of professional development will have to change. Continuous learning opportunities need to become part of teachers' everyday working lives and part of every school's institutional priorities. Administrators and teachers alike will have to develop an *ethos of inquiry*--constantly examining their own practice; seeking new knowledge about subject matter, instructional methods, and student development; questioning what they learn in light of their own experience; doing research; and thinking deeply about overall school improvement.
- *Effective professional development focuses on student learning and is evaluated at least in part on that basis.* Professional development should be judged primarily by its effect on students. To be sure, other benefits--an expanded repertoire of skills, greater collegiality--are worthwhile in and of themselves. But unless student learning improves, professional development cannot be considered a complete success. The best way to judge the effects of professional development is to conduct some sort of evaluation beyond the standard five-point scale questionnaire used after so many inservice sessions. The most helpful evaluations begin early in the planning process and continue after the initiative has been completed. Ideally, evaluations provide continuous feedback to teachers, track the effect of professional development on teachers and on the school improvement process, and use data to document its effect on student learning.

Conditions for Effective Professional Development

Using professional development as a lever for overall school improvement and greater student learning, rather than simply as a means of improving individual teachers' knowledge or skills, is a risky enterprise. Without proper supporting conditions, even the best professional development initiatives undertaken by the brightest and most motivated teachers may founder. On the other hand, in a school where the principal is a strong advocate of continuous learning, where time is built into the schedule for professional development, where teachers routinely communicate with one other and solve problems together, where innovation is encouraged, where a clear and coherent strategy for overall school improvement prevails, and where policies and resources support change, the odds are high that most or all teachers will participate in and profit from professional development.

The following four conditions are the ones most likely to influence the course of professional development initiatives:

- *Leadership.* Capable, active leadership on the part of policymakers, administrators (especially principals), and other key actors is vital to the success of professional development initiatives. The best leaders serve as advocates, showing through word and deed that they champion the cause of continuous professional growth. They provide assistance, solve problems, and remove barriers to change. They apply pressure when necessary. And they set the tone for a vibrant school culture that supports collaboration and continuous school improvement.
- *Resource and policy support.* Other forms of support in addition to leadership are vital. One is access to resources outside the school, such as research, examples of effective practice, and the creative ideas of experts. Policy coherence at all levels is also crucial, or else schools can be inundated with competing demands. Ideally, school, district, and state improvement plans are coordinated into a seamless whole targeted at increasing student learning, and the district and state have an infrastructure of policies and resources in place that support continuous professional development.
- *Norms of collegiality and experimentation.* Professional development is much more likely to be successful in schools where teachers interact frequently with one another and with administrators, where the interactions focus on teaching and learning rather than on problem students, and where risk taking and innovation are encouraged.
- *Adequate time.* Teachers' working days are almost completely absorbed by classroom responsibilities. However, without adequate time for involvement in decision making, collaboration, follow-up activities, continuous study, and evaluation, the odds that any professional development initiative will benefit teachers and students are low. There are essentially two options for increasing professional development time. One is to add time to the school calendar (this is discussed in the Options section below). The other is to make more effective use of time within the school calendar. Among the many suggestions for "creative scheduling" mentioned in the research literature are expanded staffing (hiring rotating teachers, using substitutes), common planning time, alternative

grouping and programming (bringing students together in large groups to free teachers), and banked time.

Guidelines for State Policy on Teacher Time for Professional Development

In light of the principles established above, how might state policy in Indiana make teacher time available for school-oriented professional development, that is, professional development directed to the concrete needs of individual schools? The following 10 guidelines chart out a general direction for ways state policy on teacher time for professional development might define the purpose, scheduling, allocation, and use of that time. Specific options and suggestions are provided in the final two sections of the Executive Summary.

Guideline 1: State provision of teacher time for professional development should be based upon and integrated into local plans for school improvement in which teachers at the school have been involved.

This guideline points out a natural link between the principles of effective professional development and Indiana's Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA) System, specifically the provisions in the system for local school improvement plans. Together, the principles and the state's commitment to school improvement suggest that the overarching purpose of state-provided teacher time for professional development should be to enhance the design and implementation of local plans for school improvement--plans in which teachers are actively involved.

Guideline 2: Time for professional development that enhances school improvement should be provided on the job.

Guideline 3: The scheduling of teacher time for professional development should be flexible enough to provide opportunities before, during, and after the regular school day and school year, as local plans for school improvement necessitate.

Because the focus of professional development is the local school, it stands to reason that teachers will need time at the school to gather information, analyze problems, seek solutions, and test those solutions. Thus, teachers should be encouraged to view school-oriented professional development as an integral part of their job, and schools should be prepared to grant teachers the necessary time on the job to carry out those responsibilities. Of course, some professional development might be most effective if scheduled off site--for example, to permit teachers to observe programs in other schools. But decisions about appropriate scheduling need to be made at the school.

Guideline 4: The scheduling of teacher time for professional development should encourage participating teachers to work together to develop and carry out plans for school improvement.

Some of the critical ingredients of effective professional development--such as peer observation, peer coaching, research teams, program evaluation--require teachers to work with one another at the school site. Thus, schools must be prepared to schedule

school-oriented professional development to permit teachers to work together to design, implement, assess, and revise school improvement plans and activities.

Guideline 5: The scheduling of teacher time for professional development should maintain instructional coherence and continuity for students.

Thoughtful planning will be necessary in light of the need to ensure that student learning is not unduly interrupted during school hours. After all, the basic purpose of professional development is the improvement of student learning. Principals and teachers might consider, for example, using any funds provided to support teacher time for professional development to employ regular substitutes, part-time teachers, or teachers shared with other schools to allow teachers to work together during the school day. Rules about the use of such funds must be flexible enough to permit these arrangements.

Guideline 6: Time for professional development should be targeted to projects and teachers where it is most needed for school improvement.

Guideline 7: The provision of time for professional development should permit sustained involvement of participating teachers.

The proposed purpose of state-supported professional development time (Guideline 1) suggests that those teachers who are willing to be deeply involved in the complex and time-consuming work of improving their schools ought to be given priority in the allocation of that time. Moreover, the research on effective professional development suggests that involvement must be sustained over a considerable time for teachers to make real changes in their schools and their teaching. Thus, the state provision of time for school-oriented professional development must not take the familiar form of doling out to all teachers the annual day of professional development to be taken at individual teachers' discretion. Instead, state policy must encourage the teachers and administrators in a school to allocate time to projects that serve the school's highest priorities for improvement and, therefore, to the teachers involved in those projects.

Guideline 8: The appropriate uses of teacher time for professional development should be defined flexibly enough to meet the requirements of school improvement plans and the various elements of effective professional development, such as planning, instruction, practice, coaching, and evaluation.

Guideline 9: Time made available for professional development should be reserved for that purpose and thus be protected from utilization for the other manifold demands made on teachers.

Defining the use of teacher time for professional development too narrowly could prove counterproductive, since the needs of local schools vary considerably. Also, research on professional development suggests that many different types of activities are necessary in improving school performance. As long as state-supported time for professional development is thoughtfully scheduled, the state should permit its use for the wide range of activities related to the development and execution of school improvement plans.

Guideline 10: Additional support should be provided to make the use of teacher time for professional development most effective.

Time alone is not sufficient for teachers to succeed in the task of school improvement. There is a crucial role for others in and outside the school to play in providing the support, information, and ideas upon which that growth may depend. Therefore, a comprehensive state policy for school-oriented professional development must consider how teachers can gain access to the support needed to help them develop and carry out plans for school improvement. This support could range from assistance in establishing collaborative procedures for school improvement to access to recent developments in subject matter knowledge.

Options for a System of Time for Professional Development

From the principles and guidelines discussed above, a range of options emerge for establishing and funding a state system of teacher time for professional development. Among the options:

- The state could provide time by permitting some of the currently mandated 180 days of instruction to be used for professional development, effectively shortening the instructional year. The state could lengthen the school year and require that the added days be used for professional development. Or the state could leave the current instructional year intact and require that a specific number of person-days be provided for professional development.
- The state could establish an independent program for professional development. Or the state could incorporate the system within PBA.
- Time for professional development could be controlled by the school corporation or the school.
- The state could provide funds to pay for teacher professional development time. The state could require school corporations to pay the costs out of their base tuition revenue. Or the state and school corporations could share costs.
- To regulate the use of teacher time for professional development, the state could require schools to produce a detailed school plan that specifies precisely how teachers would be using the time. Or the state could permit a more general plan in which the school could demonstrate that it satisfies the guidelines for state policy without providing details about the use of time.
- If the state provides additional resources to schools beyond the provision of teacher time, these resources could take the form of directly provided services delivered by the IDOE. The state could establish a competitive grant program. The state could provide restricted across-the-board funds to schools. Or the state could provide unrestricted across-the-board funds to schools.

Overview of a State System of Teacher Time for Professional Development

An analysis of these options in light of the principles and guidelines discussed above suggests a general picture of the way an effective state system of teacher time for professional development might work in Indiana. Such a system would join the

state, local schools, and their teachers in a coordinated effort at school improvement under the aegis of PBA. Each school in the state would have an annual reservoir of teacher time made available by state support and thoughtful, creative scheduling at the school. Teachers would use that time to participate in the school community's identification of priorities for school improvement and then to work in teams over sustained periods on specific school improvement projects to meet those priorities.

While working on such projects, teachers could gather relevant research; observe at other schools using innovative approaches; receive instruction in subject matter, school organization, and teaching methods; experiment with new techniques; give and receive feedback on their efforts to change instruction; and conduct research on the effectiveness of their efforts in improving student learning. To enhance the work of the teams, teachers would have access to materials and individuals who could provide them with ideas and assistance relevant to the school improvement projects.

Finally, as projects succeed and mature and as school improvement priorities evolve, other teachers at each school would become involved in professional development. Indeed, schools involved in the linked processes of school improvement and school-oriented professional development would become centers of continuous learning for both teachers and students.

More specifically, such a system might include the following components:

- A mandate that schools allocate a specific number of person-days each year per full-time equivalent (FTE) teacher for school-oriented professional development, perhaps five days for schools in their PBA year or on probation and three days for other schools.
- State-dedicated funding to fully support this mandate, calculated perhaps as a multiple of the average daily salary of teachers in the state. This would cost the state approximately $40 million each year for the five-day/three-day plan suggested above.
- Allocation of teacher time directly to schools rather than to school corporations, with provisions for schools to transfer their time to other schools in special cases.
- A requirement that schools as part of their PBA school improvement plan develop a written five-year strategic plan for professional development time that involves teacher participation, focuses teacher time on projects that meet the school's highest priorities for improvement, schedules time for professional development to permit effective teamwork on those projects and to maintain instructional continuity for students, provides sustained and supportive training to involved teachers, modifies projects on the basis of their effects on student learning, and explains how other resources to support the effective use of teacher time will be obtained.
- Submission of brief annual fiscal and performance reports, as part of the state-mandated report card, accounting for the use of state funds and the extent and purpose of professional development time utilized in each school.
- The provision of state start-up assistance to schools and the maintenance of state infrastructure services to support the effective use of teacher time.
- The provision of state as well as local funding to help individual schools obtain specific additional resources needed for staff development.

Chapter 1

Professional Development: Definition, Rationale, and Current Practice

Five years ago, President Bush and the nation's governors (including Bill Clinton of Arkansas) convened in Charlottesville, Virginia, to formulate a set of education goals for America. After much debate, the group generated a list of six national goals that addressed (1) pre-school education, (2) the high school graduation rate, (3) math and science achievement, (4) student competency in additional subjects, (5) adult literacy, and (6) student discipline.

When President Clinton signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act into law earlier this year, two new goals had been added to the list. One focused on increasing the involvement of parents in the education of their children. The other addressed professional development for teachers:

> By the year 2000, the Nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills . . . needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century. (Goals 2000: Educate America Act § 102, 1994)

This addition to the national goals reflects a growing consensus among educators, researchers, and policymakers that it is futile to call for profound changes in America's schools without giving practicing teachers the opportunities for professional growth they need to bring those changes about.

Of course, inservice training for practicing teachers has been part of the education landscape since the middle of the 19th century. Unfortunately, the form this training has most often taken--occasional workshops conducted by outside consultants with little or no follow-up--is widely regarded by teachers as a waste of time. "Every teacher in America's public schools has taken inservice courses, workshops, and training programs," writes Albert Shanker (1990). "But as universal as the practice has been, so is the disappointment among teachers and management as to the usefulness of most staff development experiences" (p. 91).

It is unlikely, then, that traditional teacher training will serve as the lever that helps transform elementary and secondary education in America. Unless more effective forms of teacher development are provided, the current education reform movement will probably go the way of past reform movements: a lot of splendid rhetoric, some well-intended but brief experiments, and a quick return to the status quo. "America's schools need forms of professional development that break from traditional patterns of inservice training that have been employed for so long," write Richard Wallace and his colleagues. "We need staff development that is dramatically

different, not just in content, but in form of delivery and level of commitment" (Wallace, LeMahieu, & Bickel, 1990, p. 185).

What might effective professional development for 21st century schooling look like? What have we learned from past professional development efforts that can lead to more successful professional development in the future? What are various states around the country doing to enhance professional development in their schools? How much will a commitment to professional development cost? And--perhaps the most vexing question of all--how can schools make more time available for professional development when teachers are also being called upon to increase the number of contact hours with students?

To help answer some of these questions, the Indiana Education Policy Center School of Education Office, under contract with the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), conducted a study of professional development and its connection to teacher time. Over the past three months, Center staff:

- Contacted over three dozen organizations around the country seeking information and advice on effective forms of professional development;
- Conducted a thorough literature review, scanning a number of electronic and printed indexes;
- Contacted agencies in states bordering Indiana (Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio) and other states noted for their professional development programs (Florida, Georgia, and Washington);
- Talked with IDOE employees to find out about state-level professional development activities in Indiana;
- Reviewed the research on uses of instructional time to learn how schools, districts, and states might reschedule days and years to free teachers for professional development;
- Held a 90-minute conference call with representatives of various Indiana state agencies and three professional development experts--Michael Fullan, Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto; Susan Loucks-Horsley, Senior Associate, The NETWORK, Inc., and the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands; and Dennis Sparks, Executive Director, National Staff Development Council--to discuss an earlier draft of this report.

The rest of chapter 1 defines what we mean by professional development, explains why professional development has achieved such a prominent place on the education reform agenda, and examines current professional development practices. Chapter 2 describes statewide professional development policies and programs in Indiana and selected states. Chapter 3 sets forth five research-based principles of effective professional development and four conditions necessary to support it. Chapter 4 develops 10 guidelines for state policy on teacher time for professional development. Finally, chapter 5 presents and analyzes a number of policy options for making teacher time available for professional development in Indiana.

Professional Development Defined

Some publications make distinctions between inservice education, professional development, and staff development. For example, the ERIC Document Reproduction Service defines inservice education as "courses or programs designed to provide employee/staff growth in job-related competencies or skills, often sponsored by employers, usually at the professional level," professional development as "activities to enhance professional growth," and staff development as "employer-sponsored activities, or provisions such as release time and tuition grants, through which existing personnel renew or acquire skills, knowledge, and attitudes related to job or personal development."

In this report, inservice education refers to discrete--and often mandatory--programs designed by school or district administrators to improve the job-related knowledge, skills, or competencies of teachers. The terms professional development and staff development are used interchangeably to refer to something much broader than that. For reasons that will become clear in chapter 3, these two terms encompass the full range of activities that enhance the professional performance of practicing teachers both in and outside the classroom, including reflection, research, analysis of student needs, peer observation, collaborative planning and problem solving, involvement in decision making, and participation in school improvement processes, along with more traditional skills training and knowledge growth.

As this definition suggests, we do not consider professional development simply a means of correcting teachers' weaknesses, but also a way of building on strengths, opening new doors, and providing opportunities for growth for individual teachers and entire school faculties united in an effort to improve student learning.

Of course, teachers are not the only people involved in the education of youth for whom professional development is appropriate. Counselors, principals, central office administrators, school board members, department of education personnel--all could benefit from activities that promote professional growth. In this report, however, we focus on teachers for two reasons. First, the explicit charge of the IDOE, for which this report was prepared, was to examine professional development for teachers and suggest ways that teacher time could be expanded or re-arranged to make new learning opportunities available. Second, since teachers have more direct effects on student learning than any other members of the education work force, and less opportunity during their workday to participate in professional development activities, it makes sense to focus on teachers.

Why Professional Development Now?

The main reason professional development is so important today is that teachers are being asked to do more than ever before, and they need additional skills to do it. Because Indiana's teaching force is relatively experienced, much of this training will need to come in the form of professional development for practicing teachers, rather than preservice training for prospective teachers in colleges or universities.

Greater Demands on Teachers

True or not, the perception across the land is that student achievement in America has been declining over the past three decades. Under any circumstances this decline would be cause for concern. It is particularly alarming given the demands of an increasingly technological, increasingly service oriented, increasingly global workplace, which will require American workers not only to outwork but also to out-*think* competitors from around the world. To prepare for these demands, students need to learn complex skills such as problem solving, critical thinking, teamwork, computer literacy, and real-world applications in addition to the more traditional skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Even as learning requirements escalate, however, students are bringing heavier baggage with them to school--everything from poverty, child abuse, divorce, and violence on the streets to short attention spans from watching too much TV. The mix of students is changing as well. Where teachers in the 1970s might have greeted row after row of white, middle-class faces in their classrooms, they may now see more African-American, Hispanic, Japanese, or Vietnamese children than whites, some of whom may barely speak English. And as the inclusion movement gains momentum, more and more children with disabilities will be assimilated into the regular classroom along with students of different races, cultures, and backgrounds.

The traditional school system is simply not capable of addressing these new challenges, many critics say. Nor will minor reforms--an increased graduation requirement here, a new reading program there--be enough to turn the system around. Rather, some say, a restructuring of the entire system is necessary, a sweeping transformation of the purpose, organization, and operation of schools. Restructuring generally refers to some or all of the following:

- innovations in curriculum and instruction, such as thematic learning, cooperative learning, team teaching, multi-age grouping, and attention to multiple learning styles;
- changes in assessment, that is, moving away from standardized multiple-choice tests to performance-based assessments and portfolios of student work;
- decentralized decision-making structures, often called site-based management plans, that transfer power from district and state bureaucracies to principals, teachers, and parents at individual schools. Under many site-based management plans, these local agents--particularly teachers--often have the opportunity and the responsibility to forge a unique and coherent vision for the school.

In addition to encouraging school restructuring, many states are developing new, more rigorous academic standards for students. Although the standard-setting process has been under way in one form or another for years, it has recently acquired a higher profile as a result of federal initiatives. Funded partly by the U.S. Department of Education, various national organizations (for example, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Council for Geographic Education) have been developing voluntary national standards. Additionally, the Goals 2000 legislation provides millions of dollars to help states formulate their own high standards for students. Many of the new standards will

oblige teachers to know more about the subject matter they teach and to employ unfamiliar instructional techniques.

Indiana is involved in one way or another in all these reforms. The Indiana 2000 program provides grants and waivers to schools that are committed to the restructuring process. The Indiana Performance Assessment for Student Success (IPASS), to be implemented in 1995, will include performance assessment tasks along with traditional multiple-choice questions. Students will also be required to maintain portfolios of their work. The state is applying for a federal grant under Goals 2000 that will facilitate an ongoing standard-setting process in a variety of subjects.

In addition to these and other state initiatives, many districts and individual schools in Indiana are undertaking significant innovations on their own. This suggests that teachers themselves have higher expectations for their own work. Often teachers are initiating change, rather than simply responding to demands from elsewhere.

Aging Teaching Force

As the many challenges and reforms mentioned above should make clear, teachers are being asked to do more today than ever before. However, because a majority of teachers have been on the job for many years, they may have been trained to teach in ways that are no longer appropriate to the task.

The average teacher in Indiana has been teaching for 15.3 years, slightly above the national average of 14.5 years. Almost two thirds of Indiana teachers have over 10 years of experience, according to IDOE figures. What's more, when schools hire teachers, they don't always hire new ones straight from college. According to a recent RAND study (Kirby, Grissmer, & Hudson, 1991), in the late 1980s almost 60% of new hires in Indiana were experienced teachers.

In one sense, this is good news. Experience is the best teacher, for educators as well as doctors, lawyers, athletes, police officers, and those in other walks of life. Experienced teachers have a savvy born of thousands of practical encounters with real students in real classrooms that not even their brightest colleagues fresh out of teacher education programs can match.

However, this also means that many of the teachers who are being asked to implement revolutionary changes in schools received most of their formal training years or even decades ago, when the information age was only a gleam in the eye of computer visionaries, when the most advanced technology in the school was a television set, when global competition was something that happened once every four years in the Olympics. No matter how talented our teachers, no matter how dedicated, many of them are going to need substantial opportunities for professional growth and development if they are to succeed in transforming schools for the 21st century.

The case for professional development, then, is clear. If significant changes are to take place in our schools, professional development will be one necessary vehicle for those changes.

Current Professional Development Practices

To be sure, opportunities for professional development are in no short supply in many states and school districts around the country. Federal dollars fund professional development programs such as the Eisenhower math and science programs, as well as

professional development components of special education, vocational education, Title 1 (formerly called Chapter 1), and other programs. State departments of education routinely offer technical assistance and workshops on all sorts of mandates and educational innovations to schools. Universities offer graduate coursework, and education faculty form partnerships with school districts to introduce innovations and provide the requisite professional development. Some universities have professional development schools, where future and practicing teachers can improve their skills, test innovations, and conduct collaborative research with university faculty. School districts, provided they have the funding, have access to a vast array of professional development programs offered by an army of roving consultants, experts, and trainers. Some states and districts also have established their own teacher centers, which operate as training and materials centers for teachers.

It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the organization, delivery, cost, and benefits of this array of professional development activities in Indiana, much less in the nation as a whole. However, it is possible to give some idea of the extent of professional development on the state and local level by summarizing a large-scale study of professional development in California undertaken by Judith Warren Little and her colleagues (Little, Gerritz, Stern, Guthrie, Kirst, & Marsh, 1987). They surveyed all districts in the state, did in-depth research on a representative sample of 30 districts (including personal interviews with almost 400 administrators and phone interviews with almost 500 teachers), and analyzed documents pertaining to state-funded and state-administered professional development programs. Among the conclusions they reached were the following:

- *Funding*: Professional development programs for teachers and administrators (excluding graduate courses) consume about 1.8% of the state's education funds. The largest portion of that funding consists of allocations from the general funds of school districts, followed by state funds appropriated specifically for professional development. The average expenditure per teacher is $1,360. If the cost of future salary obligations to teachers who earn credits through colleges or state-approved workshops is included, the cost of professional development would more than double, to almost 4% of total education expenditures.
- *Commitment*: Teachers and administrators are committed to professional development. For every dollar actually spent on professional development, teachers contribute 60 cents in uncompensated time.
- *District management*: Most professional development activities are designed and administered by district personnel. Teachers are rarely involved in designing the form or content of professional development activities.
- *Minimal effects on teaching*: Professional development resources are used in ways that generally reinforce traditional teaching methods and school structures. Professional development is largely market driven, consisting of menus of workshops available to teachers on a sign-up basis and delivered by paid presenters. Professional development does little to reduce teacher isolation or to engage teachers in rigorous examination of current practices. It is a peripheral activity, squeezed by the traditional school schedule into widely separated time slots. There is little long-term involvement by groups of

teachers in intensive professional development activities. Few professional development activities are linked to a well-established school support system.

- *Lack of evaluation*: Professional development workshops are regularly evaluated on a session-by-session basis, usually to help trainers improve content and presentation. Rarely is professional development evaluated in terms of its effects on teachers or students, the coherence of its goals, or the relationship between its goals and other school improvement efforts.
- *Lack of comprehensive state policy*: California appropriates professional development funds for teachers, schools, districts, counties, and universities, but it lacks a comprehensive or consistent policy for professional development.

On the whole, then, Little and her colleagues describe a situation in which a good deal of money and effort is being expended on professional development, with little evidence of significant changes in student learning, teachers' behavior, or school organization.

Little and her colleagues did uncover some positive findings, however:

- Teachers who were consistent supporters of professional development outnumbered teachers who were consistent critics six to one. The consistent supporters were much more likely to teach in schools where professional development was an accepted part of daily routines and where teachers and administrators worked together in planning and leading professional development.
- Follow-up activities helped teachers transfer new skills to the classroom. Although fewer than 10% of teachers devoted more than 50 hours to follow-up over a one-year period, those teachers were four times more likely to report large classroom effects than were teachers who devoted less than 10 hours to follow-up.
- Teachers given release time during the salaried workday would rather spend that time observing colleagues than attending workshops. Almost 95% of teachers who had the opportunity to observe colleagues seven or more times and discuss what they were seeing reported that this opportunity had a great impact on their teaching, compared with fewer than 2% who had only a single opportunity to observe colleagues. Unfortunately, time for observation was not readily available.

These findings--the importance of follow-up, observation, teacher involvement, and schoolwide support--reflect some of the principles for effective professional development that have emerged in the research literature over the past decade. These principles will be further discussed in chapter 3. First, however, we turn to our own examination of state-level professional development policies.

Chapter 2

State-Level Professional Development Policies in Indiana and Selected States

As Judith Warren Little's study of California suggests, professional development in American public schools is enormously complex, involving local, state, and federal activities that focus variously on preservice teacher education, initial licensing and license renewal, and a huge assortment of opportunities, incentives, and requirements for practicing school professionals. This chapter provides brief descriptions of the *state-level* policies, programs, and trends in professional development *for practicing teachers* in Indiana and seven other states.

These descriptions of state-level policies are intended as a helpful starting place for thinking about ways to change and improve current policies. The other states surveyed include those adjacent to Indiana: Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio. Three additional states that have a national reputation for their state professional development policies were also surveyed: Florida, Georgia, and Washington. Center staff reviewed the statutes of these states, analyzed other relevant documents, and spoke to state department of education staff responsible for professional development. The appendix to this report includes a brief summary of the major policies and programs identified in each state.

It has not been possible within the scope of this study to include everything of relevance to professional development that goes on at the state level. For example, many staff members in departments of education in Indiana and these other states also provide continuing technical assistance to teachers and other professionals in local schools through occasional workshops on state programs and specific approaches to teaching.

This chapter also does not consider licensing provisions for education professionals or inservice professional development opportunities for school administrators, counselors, or other support staff. Nor does it consider the many professional development activities that teachers undertake on their own, through, for example, their involvement in state and national professional organizations, such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. And because of the focus on state-level activities, federal policies and programs related to teacher professional development, many of which are administered by states, were not studied in detail.

Most importantly, because the aim of this report is to discuss state policy, this chapter does not consider in detail the policies of local school corporations and individual schools, where perhaps the majority of professional development activities

for practicing teachers take place. For example, Table 2.1 reports on three types of teacher time related to professional development that are included in Indiana's local collective bargaining contracts--time beyond the state-required 180 days of student instruction for locally provided inservice education, inservice education sponsored by the Indiana State Teachers Association, and orientation of teachers by local school authorities. As the table indicates, almost all contracts provide time for one or more of these activities. However, these extra days are only the tip of the proverbial iceberg of locally provided professional development. For instance, many--perhaps most--school corporations also provide some funding and release time for teachers to attend state and national professional conferences and inservice workshops outside dedicated inservice days. Moreover, school corporations' salary schedules reward teachers for completing graduate course work and degrees. In any case, it is important to note that this report on state-level policies on professional development for practicing teachers is not intended to describe the amount, variety, content, or format of locally provided professional development opportunities and incentives.

Table 2.1
Local Contract Provisions for Professional Development Days in Indiana[a]

	Inservice days	ISTA days	Inservice or ISTA days or both	Orientation days	Inservice, ISTA, or orientation days or any combination
Number of school corporations providing	149	50	181	251	275
Average for those providing	1.37 days	1.63 days	1.53 days	1.09 days	2.04 days
Range for those providing	0.5 - 5 days	0.5 - 2 days	0.5 - 5 days	0.5 - 2 days	0.5 - 7 days
Average for all school corporations	0.71 days	0.28 days	0.99 days	0.95 days	1.94 days

[a] This table includes data on 289 of the 296 Indiana school corporations.

SOURCE: Indiana School Boards Association, 1994.

Indiana's Professional Development Policies for Practicing Teachers

As the state's major administrative entity for elementary and secondary education, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is responsible for

implementing most of the state's policies for the professional development of Indiana's practicing teachers. These policies include four that apply to all school corporations in the state: Performance-Based Accreditation, accumulated (or banked) time, the Beginning Teacher Internship program, and professional development for the state's new student assessment system. In addition, the state operates three other programs that emphasize professional development for which schools and school corporations can apply: CLASS, Indiana 2000, and Re:Learning. Below are brief descriptions of these policies and programs that highlight their provisions for professional development.

Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA)

In 1987, the State Board of Education was directed to "establish a performance-based accreditation system for schools" in the state (IC § 20-1-1.2-2, Burns 1992). Under PBA, all public schools and volunteer private schools are reviewed every five years for compliance with certain legal standards, school improvement plans, and state performance standards based on student attendance rates, high school graduation rates, state test results, and state proficiencies in mathematics and language arts. When PBA was developed, it was intended to be more than an accrediting system; it was designed to be a process to assist schools in making a "conscientious, concerted, focused effort to become effective schools" in terms of student performance (*PBA Program Manual,* 1993, pp. 1-2).

Professional development is specifically addressed in PBA's school improvement planning process. It is one of nine correlate areas that schools must incorporate in their improvement processes and written improvement plans. The professional development correlate stipulates that professional development programs should be related to school improvement and professional growth and that school faculty members should be "actively involved in planning professional development based on needs they have identified" (*PBA Program Manual,* 1993, p. 14). In addition, another correlate on program evaluation recognizes the need for schools to "systematically and comprehensively" evaluate their educational programs and services, including their professional development activities (p. 13).

The IDOE division for PBA offers professional development to schools on request. It also provides technical assistance and professional development to schools that receive less than the five-year full accreditation. In 1993-94, the PBA division spent $421,000 delivering professional development and technical assistance to schools. This year, 1994-95, the division has been allocated $427,000 to deliver services to schools.

Accumulated (Banked) Time for Professional Development

In 1990, the Indiana State Board of Education adopted a policy that permits schools to release students to conduct professional development activities. According to the policy, students may be released "only under the provisions of an [IDOE] approved plan that meets specified criteria. To take advantage of this policy a school corporation must have a base of 105% of [the required] instructional time before any accumulated time may be used" for professional development (Schweitzer, 1994, attachment 1, p. 6). For example, elementary schools are required by law to provide 900 hours of student instruction--180 days at 5 hours per day. Thus, elementary

schools are not eligible to accumulate time for professional development unless they schedule at least 945 hours of instruction. Secondary schools are eligible to accumulate time only if they schedule at least 1,134 instructional hours (Schweitzer, 1994, attachment 3).

The State Board has specified how accumulated, or "banked," time, can be used. For example, schools may use accumulated time for PBA or professional development activities in time periods of not less than 30 minutes and not more than two and a half hours on any one day. The maximum amount of time for which schools can release students is the amount of time a school's calendar exceeds 105% of the required minimum instructional time or 15 hours, whichever is less. For example, then, elementary schools must schedule at least 960 hours of instructional time in order to use the full 15 hours of banked time permitted. Also, schools cannot release students on more than six occasions in any school year (Schweitzer, 1994, attachment 2). In addition to or instead of banked time, schools always have the option of adding more days to the required instructional year to use for professional development. It should be noted that banked time and days added to the school calendar can be used for activities other than professional development. However, regardless of how schools schedule and use their additional time, students must be in attendance at least 180 days each year.

Beginning Teacher Internship Program

Since 1988-89, all first-year teachers have been required to serve a one-year internship under the guidance of a mentor teacher. The mentor is responsible for observing, advising, and supporting the beginning teacher. The school principal periodically evaluates the beginning teacher and is ultimately responsible for determining the success of the internship.

Local school corporations develop their own internship programs based on general guidelines provided by the state. Since 1988, fewer than 3% of all beginning teachers have had to repeat the program or have been denied continued certification. Mentor teachers generally receive a $600 stipend and five days of release time to carry out their responsibilities. The state has allocated about $1.8 million per year to the program, which has served nearly 10,000 Indiana teachers since its inception.

A RAND study of the first year of the program (1988-89) concluded that the Beginning Teacher Internship program "appears to provide an improved learning environment for new teachers and shows promise of reducing attrition rates" (Hudson, Grissmer, & Kirby, 1991).

Indiana Performance Assessment for Student Success and Professional Development

"A fundamental premise of the [state's] new assessment system is that it will not achieve its true potential to improve education unless teachers and other educators receive training and are involved in other professional development activities" ("Professional Development Update," 1994, p. 5). For this reason, the IDOE has held focus groups with teachers and others to determine the best strategies for conducting professional development (and public awareness) programs. The IDOE is now in the process of determining the various activities it will use to meet the training needs of teachers and other educators across the state. Two initiatives are under way in fall

1994: one for mathematics, the other for language arts. The goal of both programs is eventually to "reach every teacher with information about the new assessment system" (p. 5).

The mathematics program has 75 trained facilitators offering 12 MATHA (Mathematics Assessment: The Hoosier Alternative) workshops to school personnel this fall. These sessions are structured for grades K-4 and 5-8, with registration held to 50 for each grade level. Also this fall, 100 facilitators are being trained for the language arts program.

In 1995, the mathematics and language arts facilitators will hold a series of training sessions for other teachers from across the state. Each high school and middle school will be asked to send two mathematics teachers to one of the mathematics sessions and two language arts teachers to one of the language arts sessions. Each elementary school will send two teachers to combined mathematics and language arts sessions. Following the workshops, these teachers will be expected to hold discussion sessions on the new assessment system with other faculty members in their schools. The IDOE has begun these programs under its current budget but is seeking specific legislative funding to expand and operate them during the next biennium.

CLASS (Connecting Learning Assures Successful Students)

Developed by former elementary teacher Barbara Pedersen in 1989-90, CLASS is designed to transform the traditional school into a community of lifelong learners. Through a variety of professional development activities, teachers learn about cooperative learning, thematic instruction, and other educational innovations. With training and follow-up coaching, they learn how to tailor these innovations to their own individual teaching styles, to the needs of their students, and to an overall school vision.

For a school to be eligible for CLASS, the principal and the corporation superintendent must agree in writing to a two-year commitment to the program. Participating schools receive a small stipend per teacher to help cover release time and supplies. The number of CLASS schools has grown from 5 in 1990-91 to 115 in 1994-95, with another 30 schools from earlier training sessions continuing to participate at their own expense. State spending has increased as well. In 1990-91, CLASS received $155,000; for 1994-95 it has been allocated $562,000, which includes some projected training expenses for 1996. (For a more detailed discussion of the professional development component of CLASS, see the final section of chapter 3, "An Indiana Example.")

Indiana 2000

Based on legislation adopted in 1991, the State Board of Education has recognized certain schools as participants in the Indiana 2000 school restructuring process. Schools selected for Indiana 2000 must adopt the national education goals and must involve teachers, parents, and business community members in developing plans for restructuring. Indiana 2000 (a) provides small grants to designated schools, (b) allows schools to develop plans to admit students who live outside the school's attendance area but have legal residence in the school corporation, and (c) permits school corporations, on behalf of the schools, to invoke waivers from any State Board of Education rule, except for rules adopted as a result of the Indiana 2000 legislation,

and to invoke waivers from any state statute on curriculum or textbook selection (IC § 20-1-1-6.3, Burns 1992).

To date, the State Board has designated 168 schools as Indiana 2000 schools, and over 100 more schools are engaged in the Indiana 2000 application process. Since 1992, the state has earmarked $675,000 per year for this program. According to one IDOE official, Indiana 2000 schools use the majority of their grant funds for professional development activities.

Re:Learning

In 1992, Indiana became the ninth state to join the Re:Learning project, a collaborative effort of the Coalition for Essential Schools and the Education Commission of the States. In adopting Re:Learning, Governor Evan Bayh and then-State Superintendent of Public Instruction H. Dean Evans made the required five-year commitment to the project and pledged to provide support for schools to explore a framework for change. States and schools that join the project agree to consider nine common principles, among them: intellectual focus, simple and universal goals, diploma by exhibition, and the student as worker. Re:Learning focuses school restructuring on improving the relationship between teachers and students, relying heavily on professional development activities. One example is the peer coaching component, which helps to establish a system of continuous support for teachers and their colleagues.

The state has allocated approximately $300,000 annually for the Re:Learning initiative. Currently, 120 elementary, middle, junior high, and high schools have received or will receive "exploring" grants--up significantly from the 30 schools that received funding during the first year of the program. More than 80 grantees have participated in TREK, a summer institute on the conditions necessary to support and sustain change (for example, positive leadership and shared vision). Another 11 have received $20,000 each in Re:Learning Restructuring with Technology grants, and 8 of these have received additional funds to support the development of a coaching culture in their schools.

State Strategies for Professional Development in Indiana and Selected States

As noted above, the appendix includes brief summaries of state-level professional development policies in Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio, which are in Indiana's immediate vicinity, as well as Florida, Georgia, and Washington. This section summarizes patterns and trends in the professional development policies of these states and Indiana.

One key issue is how states provide for teacher time for professional development in their definitions of the school year. Table 2.2 on the next page summarizes the statutory definitions of the teacher school year and the student instructional year in Indiana and the seven other states and reports the provisions for professional development time included within those definitions.

Three basic patterns emerge in this table. First, three states--Indiana, Michigan, and Washington--make no provision for teacher professional development time in the state-defined school year. As will be explained below, however, both Michigan and

Washington make available additional funds to all schools for professional development, whereas Indiana does not. Other states--Illinois and Ohio--allow school districts to choose to use some of the mandated school days for professional development instead of student instruction. A third group--Kentucky, Florida, and Georgia--include within the school year non-instructional days that may or must be used for professional development. Kentucky is unusual in combining both the second and third strategies, at least for the next two academic years.

Table 2.2
Teacher Days, Instructional Days, and Professional Development Days in Indiana and Seven Other States

State	Minimum number of teacher days required in school year[a]	Minimum number of full student instructional days required in school year[a]	Number of professional development days included in school year	
			Minimum	Maximum
Illinois	180[b]	176[c]	0	4[c]
Indiana	**180**	**180**	**0**	**0**
Kentucky	185	170[d]	4[e]	9[d]
Michigan	180	180	0	0
Ohio	182[f]	178	0	2
Florida	196	180	5[g]	16[g]
Georgia	190	180	0[h]	10[h]
Washington	180	180	0	4[i]

[a] Individual school districts may exceed these minimum requirements.
[b] Illinois requires school districts to schedule an additional five days in the school calendar in case they are needed to replace days cancelled for weather or other emergencies.
[c] In Illinois, if fewer than four professional development days are scheduled, more student instructional days are required, for a combined total of 180.
[d] Kentucky's normal number of instructional days is 175, but during 1994-95 and 1995-96, school districts are permitted to use up to five of these days for professional development. If fewer than 5 additional professional development days are scheduled, more student instructional days are required, for a combined total of 175.
[e] In Kentucky, 4 of the required 10 non-instructional days must be used for professional development. The other non-instructional time includes four days of holidays and two days for the opening and closing of the school year.
[f] Ohio permits school districts to use up to two full days for professional development and up to four half-days for parent-teacher conferences. If fewer professional development or parent-teacher conference days are scheduled, more student instructional days are required, for a combined total of 182.
[g] In Florida, at least 5 of the 16 days beyond the minimum instructional year must be used for professional development. The other 11 days can be used for teacher planning or professional development or a combination of the two.
[h] In Georgia, the 10 teacher days beyond the minimum instructional year can be used for teacher planning or professional development or a combination of the two.
[i] Washington permits schools to apply for grants to pay for up to four days of professional development beyond the minimum school year. Schools are encouraged but not required to apply for these funds.

SOURCES: State statutes for Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Florida, Georgia, and Washington; personal communications with officials in these states.

These differences in the state-defined school calendar suggest that, while all states studied make provisions for professional development for practicing teachers, they take quite different approaches in doing so. While there is a good deal of complexity in each state's overall policy for professional development, the general strategy of each can be described rather briefly:

- **Illinois** requires school districts, regional districts, and educational service centers to submit plans for professional development to the State Board of Education. Upon Board approval, state funds are provided to these entities according to a formula. In addition, school districts can use up to four instructional days to carry out their plans. Illinois also operates a competitive grant program that supports school and district planning and professional development activities.
- **Indiana** requires schools to plan for professional development as part of the state accreditation and school improvement process. It permits schools to bank time for professional development by extending the school day but does not provide other professional development time or funding to all schools. Schools may apply for several special programs that include professional development opportunities and funding.
- **Kentucky** requires school, district, and school district consortium plans for professional development that are keyed to the goals and provisions of the state's omnibus education reform law. Upon state approval of the plans, funding is provided in proportion to average daily attendance. In addition, Kentucky schools have four non-instructional days and up to five instructional days to be used in their professional development plans.
- **Michigan** has replaced most of its categorical professional development programs by a policy that requires the submission of school improvement plans that provide for professional development. The state allocates funds on a per-student basis to school districts and intermediate districts with satisfactory professional development plans. No time is provided in the regular school year.
- **Ohio** operates a competitive school-innovation grants program that includes funds that can be used for professional development. Also, all schools can use up to two instructional days for professional development.
- **Florida** requires all districts to develop school improvement plans that meet the goals of the state's school reform legislation and a five-year master plan for professional development. By a formula based on number of students served, the state requires districts to spend a minimum total on all professional development, with two thirds allocated for teachers. Schools can take advantage of state-approved and state-funded summer institutes as part of their professional development activities. At least 5 of the required 16 non-instructional days in the school year must be used for professional development.
- **Georgia** requires school districts to develop a three-year professional development plan that is updated annually. By formula, the State Board of Education calculates the minimum amount that school districts must spend

annually on professional development. Any or all of the required 10 non-instructional days can be used for professional development activities.

- **Washington** operates a program of student learning improvement grants for which individual schools in the state can apply. These grants include funds for up to four non-instructional days to be used for professional development. Virtually all schools in the state have applied for and received these grants.

These brief descriptions suggest some of the options available for state policies on professional development for practicing teachers in addition to the alternatives for providing teacher time noted above.

One set of options concerns the comprehensiveness of the state's professional development policies and the extent to which those policies are coordinated with other state education policies. For example, some states link their professional development requirements and opportunities to state reform goals; others do not. Similarly, some states link professional development to mandated school or school district improvement plans; others do not require such improvement plans or do not tie professional development to them.

A second set of options concerns the strategies for funding professional development. The states studied provide funds for professional development in several ways--by means of a formula usually based on the number of students served, by mandating that a particular share of local budgets be spent on professional development, or by operating a grant program for which schools or school districts apply.

A third set of options concerns the extent to which various units of the public education system are involved in the overall state professional development strategy. Some states focus on individual schools; others focus on entire school districts. Some states explicitly involve intermediate units in the state's professional development strategy, either existing multi-district school governance or service entities or entities formed specifically for the purpose of school improvement and professional development. And at least one state, Florida, routinely plans for and provides professional development directly to schools and school districts.

Of course, much of what states do to support professional development of practicing teachers is omitted from these brief descriptions of the overall, statewide approach each state has taken. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, most state department of education employees are involved in one way or another in providing services and technical assistance to schools and school corporations, much of which has the intention and effect of enhancing school effectiveness. It is likely that states also differ in the extent to which these services are coordinated with the overall state strategy for professional development.

Each state studied is unique in its approach to professional development for practicing teachers. This chapter has described the differences among a few states to help the reader in part to understand the complexity and variety of state professional development policy and in part to discover possibilities for changing Indiana's policies. Of course, each state has its own history, political and cultural beliefs, and economic and social circumstances. Thus, no state provides a complete model for any other. But a knowledge of how things are done elsewhere can expand our horizons in the search for appropriate and effective policies for Indiana.

With a sense of some of the alternative state policies now in effect, then, we turn next to the research literature on effective professional development, which we believe also to be an important guide to policy options for Indiana.

Chapter 3

Principles of Effective Professional Development

The principles of professional development to be discussed in this chapter derive from research conducted over the past 15 years. Before turning to these principles, however, a brief comment on the reliability of professional development research is warranted.

Using Research to Inform Professional Development Practice

Research in education is not like research in the physical sciences. Physicists and chemists can usually design experiments that test hypotheses in extremely precise ways. If, for example, chemists want to know which of two chemical compounds lowers the freezing temperature of water by a greater amount, they can add one of the compounds to one gram of water, add the other compound to another gram of water, and measure the results down to a thousandth of a degree.

Education research, like any research dealing with people rather than molecules, is rarely that straightforward. The link between cause and effect, say between a mathematics computer software program and student achievement, is usually confounded by dozens of intervening factors: how the program is implemented, the attitudes of those involved, the changing composition of the student body, the presence of other programs in the school at the same time, the socio-economic status of the students, the way achievement is measured, and so forth.

Professional development research is, if anything, even more imprecise than most kinds of education research. For one thing, professional development is often only a vehicle whereby a particular curriculum or instructional approach is put into place. If teachers receive professional development in, say, cooperative learning strategies, and student test scores rise at the end of the year, is that increase a reflection of the efficacy of that particular kind of professional development or of cooperative learning in general? If it is primarily a result of professional development, how much of the effect is due to the program itself and how much to the talents of the trainers? What effect might the school culture have had on the success of the professional development program? What effect might the initial receptiveness of participating teachers have had? In general, how can one isolate the effects of professional development from everything else that is going on in a school or district at the same time?

Perhaps because of this complexity, much of the research on professional development is limited in scope, and the results are sometimes inconsistent. "What is inevitably hidden in the effort to translate research," writes Judith Warren Little

(1993), "are all the ways in which the research findings conflict, or are limited by design flaws, or reflect particular conceptions of the phenomena under study" (p. 143). For example, studies of the effect of professional development on student learning have yielded mixed results, some showing little or no improvement and some showing significant improvement. However, many of the studies that do show higher student achievement have been criticized for a lack of methodological rigor (see Orlich, Remaley, Facemyer, Logan, & Cao, 1993).

Other studies have explored the effect of professional development on teachers' attitudes and behaviors, and many of these have found that teachers can learn to use new skills as a result of professional development--particularly when initial training is followed by coaching (see, for example, Joyce & Showers, 1988). Whether teachers use these skills appropriately or merely in mechanical fashion, and whether they continue to use the skills over time are questions generally not answered in such studies, however.

An Emerging Consensus on Effective Professional Development

Despite the mixed results of research, a relatively firm consensus has emerged among experts regarding the principles that should drive professional development. One thing virtually everyone agrees on is that one-shot workshops for teachers are generally ineffective. The odds that a teacher will learn anything of lasting value from a three-hour session on a complex new teaching method are about as high as the odds that a native English speaker will learn Spanish by listening to a single Berlitz tape. At worst, such workshops can breed cynicism, causing teachers to doubt the value of innovation and professional growth in general.

Instead of occasional, fragmented workshops, professional development activities need to include sustained training for teachers, with plenty of opportunities for observation, practice, feedback, and coaching.

However, skills training for individual teachers, no matter how well designed, may not be enough to further the sweeping innovations that need to take place in schools, according to many experts. As Judith Warren Little (1993) writes, "Much of what we anticipate in the present reforms does not lend itself to skill training because it is not readily expressed in terms of specific, transferable skills and practices" (p. 133).

What is required goes beyond skill training to *organizational development*, which involves not just changes in individual teachers' abilities but also "improvements in the capacity of the organization to solve problems and renew itself" (D. Sparks, 1994, p. 42). This means focusing on formal school structures and processes (e.g., governance, policies, channels for communication) and, perhaps more importantly, on school culture--the norms, values, and beliefs that underlie formal operations and infuse the lives of administrators, teachers, and students with meaning. It means "introducing the notion of life-long learning into our institutions, and making that goal a central factor in their organization, routines, and accountability structure" ("Making Staff," 1991, p. 4). Ultimately, it means transforming schools into "centers of inquiry," in Robert Schaefer's trenchant phrase (1967), that is, centers of continuous learning for teachers and students alike.

In this view, professional development is school based, not district based (though it must be aligned with district and state policies). It is ongoing, institutionalized, embedded in the daily lives of teachers, not an add-on, something that teachers attend once or twice a year. It is collaborative, enabling teachers to observe and coach each other, plan together, and do research together, thus breaking down the walls that so often isolate teachers in their classrooms. And it is judged according to a single overarching criterion: its effect on students. To be sure, other benefits of professional development--improved teacher attitudes, expanded repertoire of skills, greater collegiality--are worthwhile in and of themselves. But unless student learning improves, professional development cannot be considered a complete success.

Using professional development as a fulcrum for overall school improvement and greater student learning, rather than simply as a means of improving individual teachers' subject matter knowledge and teaching skills, is a risky, uncertain enterprise. It will probably call for new roles for teachers and administrators, and it will certainly place severe time demands on teachers. Thus, this approach to professional development will require strong leadership, commitment, and continuing support from everyone involved: teachers, principals, central office administrators, parents, and community members. It will also require schools to arrange teacher time in imaginative ways to facilitate collaboration, inquiry, and continuous learning. And it will probably require some additional funds.

These observations can be summarized in five broad principles of effective professional development:

- Effective professional development is school based.
- Effective professional development uses coaching and other follow-up procedures.
- Effective professional development is collaborative.
- Effective professional development is embedded in the daily lives of teachers, providing for continuous growth.
- Effective professional development focuses on student learning and is evaluated at least in part on that basis.

Even the best-designed professional development initiatives may founder, however, if the conditions in the school and district are unfavorable. The following four conditions dramatically increase the odds that a given professional development initiative will bear fruit:

- Leadership
- Resource and policy support
- Norms of collegiality and experimentation
- Adequate time.

The following section discusses each of the five principles in more detail. The section after that discusses the enabling conditions for professional development.

Five Principles of Effective Professional Development

Effective Professional Development Is School Based

As the comprehensive study of professional development in California summarized in chapter 1 suggests (Little et al., 1987), professional development today is by and large a district-level responsibility. Unfortunately, district-organized professional development often lends itself to half-day inservice programs or smorgasbords of discrete workshop offerings with little follow-up, little interconnection, and little input from teachers.

What is needed, many experts argue, is a shift from generic, district-level professional development initiatives to site-specific, school-based ones. Since every school faces unique challenges, every faculty should "enjoy the latitude to invent local solutions--to discover and develop practices that embody central values and principles" (Little, 1993, p. 133). Further, she writes, "the shift to the school site brings control over resources closer to the classroom and increases the possibility that content and context might be more closely joined" (p. 146). And instead of dispersing professional development resources so widely that they end up having little lasting impact on anyone, a school-based approach allows for a concentration of resources where they might do considerable good. Joyce and Showers (1988) argue "that more staff development resources be committed to school-based initiatives in order to focus limited resources on collective efforts to implement change" (p. 83).

Ideally, formulating a school-based professional development plan is part of a larger effort to formulate a vision for overall school improvement. (The process of formulating such a vision is itself a form of professional development, many experts say.) Professional development initiatives for individual teachers, groups of teachers, and the faculty as a whole are carefully integrated in support of the overall vision. This kind of strategic planning can keep schools from taking on too many initiatives at any given time, which leads to fragmentation and superficiality.

One of the advantages of this approach is that it inevitably gets teachers involved in the design and implementation of their own professional development activities. Such involvement can be crucial to the success of the activities. As Dennis Sparks and Susan Loucks-Horsley (1990) put it, "Research clearly indicates that involving participants in key decisions about staff development is necessary for a program to have its greatest impact" (p. 21). Involvement gives teachers the opportunity to think about and discuss their own strengths and weaknesses, the needs of the students, and the direction of the school as a whole. It gives them ownership of whatever activities they eventually choose to pursue. It encourages them to do research and conduct professional development sessions for their peers. And it helps foster the practice of collaboration in the quest for professional growth and school improvement.

Letting teachers determine their own road to growth does not preclude the use of outside expertise. It simply means that teachers are involved in selecting the activities and consultants they need, rather than being forced to sit through sessions imposed upon them by someone else.

Of course, in practice, individual schools are rarely free to chart their own school improvement courses independently of state mandates and district policies. (And as Carl Glickman and Emily Calhoun point out in a 1991 article, not all schools

are ready for decentralization due to lack of knowledge or lack of the collective will to change.) Schools often have to implement reforms that have been passed down from above. Even these cases, however, need not preclude teacher involvement in professional development. As Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990) write, "When teachers cannot be involved in initial decisions regarding staff development (e.g., when it is mandated by state legislation or when it supports the use of district-wide curriculum), their involvement in decisions about the 'hows' and 'whens' of implementation can be important to success" (p. 21).

Principles of School-Based Professional Development

- Shift primary responsibility for professional development design and implementation to the school site.
- Make professional development part of an overall school improvement plan.
- Involve teachers in the design and implementation of professional development.
- Refrain from undertaking too many professional development initiatives at once, and make sure the initiatives that are pursued are integrated with one another and with the school improvement plan.

Effective Professional Development Uses Coaching and Other Follow-Up Procedures

Under a school-based approach to professional development, skills training is no longer considered the single path to teacher growth. However, it will often form a part of any school improvement plan, and when it does, it needs to be conducted in the most effective manner.

Although there is occasional evidence to the contrary (see, for example, Hargreaves and Dawe, 1990; Wade, 1984-85), most researchers have found that follow-up procedures, especially coaching, are vital if training is to have any lasting effect on teachers' behavior in the classroom. As mentioned above, single training sessions with no follow-up are largely ineffective. Professional development activities that deploy sessions spaced over time have better results (see G. M. Sparks, 1983).

In a series of original studies as well as analyses of other studies, professional development researchers and practitioners Bruce Joyce, Beverly Showers, and their colleagues have identified a combination of training procedures that appear to yield impressive changes in teachers' knowledge and classroom behavior (see Joyce & Showers, 1982; Joyce & Showers, 1988; Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987). The procedures, which need not be followed in strict order, are as follows:

- *Theory*: presentation of the theory and research underlying new teaching skills;
- *Demonstration*: opportunities for teachers to observe new skills in action;

- *Practice and feedback*: opportunities to practice under simulated conditions and obtain input on one's progress;
- *Coaching*: the provision of feedback by trainers or peers as teachers begin to incorporate new skills into their classroom repertoire.

As Table 3.1 suggests, the first three procedures have proven reasonably successful in increasing teachers' knowledge and skills. Unfortunately, the mere development of new teaching skills does not guarantee that they will be used by the teacher. As the third column in the table shows, none of these three procedures, alone or in combination, had any significant effect on teachers' transfer of the skill to the classroom.

However, when coaching is included, significant increases in transfer occur--an effect size of 1.68, compared with an effect size of 0.39 for theory/demonstration/ practice/feedback and an effect size of zero for all other combinations (see the note in the table for a definition of effect size). "It appears," write Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987), "that the coaching process enables nearly all teachers to sustain practice and gain executive control over a large range of curricular and instructional practices" (p. 86).

Table 3.1
Effect Sizes* for Training Outcomes by Training Components

Training Procedures and Combinations	Training Outcomes		
	Knowledge	Skill	Transfer of Training to Classroom
Theory	0.15	0.50	0.00
Demonstration	1.65	0.26	0.00
Theory/Demo.	0.66	0.86	0.00
Theory/Demo./ Practice/Feedback	1.31	1.18	0.39
Theory/Demo./ Practice/Feedback/ Coaching	2.71	1.25	1.68

* Effect size is a statistical calculation used to measure the magnitude of the effect of a given procedure. Technically, it is the difference between the mean of the experimental and control groups divided by the standard deviation of the control group. Hence, an effect size of 1.00 means that subjects in the experimental group scored 1 standard deviation higher than subjects in the control group.

SOURCE: Adapted from Joyce & Showers, 1988, p. 71.

There are two main types of coaching: coaching by experts (trainers, for example) and coaching by peers, that is, giving teams of teachers the opportunity to observe one another and provide feedback and support. Interestingly, research suggests that, despite the greater expertise that trainers bring to the coaching situation, peer coaching may actually be more effective in changing teachers' behavior. In a small but suggestive experiment, Georgea Mohlman Sparks (1986) compared the effects of three types of professional development activities on the performance of teachers: (a) workshops alone, (b) workshops plus coaching by the trainer, and (c) workshops plus peer coaching. She found that teachers in the third group improved more than those who were coached by experts. Sparks offers three reasons why peer coaching may be more effective than coaching by experts:

- Teachers rarely get to see one another in action. "Just watching a colleague teach may have been a powerful learning experience," she writes (p. 223).
- The peer coaches had to analyze the behavior of other teachers, which may have helped them analyze their own behavior more accurately.
- Structured interactions with other teachers may have led to a heightened sense of trust and esprit de corps.

In fact, simply scheduling opportunities for teachers to interact, even if the interactions do not take the form of peer coaching, may enhance the effectiveness of professional development workshops (see G. M. Sparks, 1983). Sparks suggests organizing discussion groups of no more than eight members who meet regularly to discuss new concepts and share experiences.

It may also be advisable to form a cadre of especially talented and motivated teachers (or simply to let one emerge) who receive additional training, as Joyce and his colleagues did in a school district in Georgia (see Joyce, Murphy, Showers, & Murphy, 1989). That way, when the outside consultants leave, the training can continue with district and school people now assuming the role as experts. "The important feature," write Joyce and Showers (1988), "is that the system include a commitment to the development of in-house competence wherever feasible, relying on external consultants primarily to build the capability of the within-district personnel" (p. 14). Teachers also tend to be more favorably disposed to training when it comes from fellow teachers rather than from consultants.

Whatever form they take, follow-up activities are an essential part of successful professional development programs. Teachers need time to absorb new knowledge, practice new techniques (Joyce and Showers estimate that 20 to 25 practice episodes are necessary to learn to use a reasonably complex new teaching technique), and adapt what they have learned to their particular classroom situations. The National Staff Development Council (1994) suggests that as much as 50% of training funds be devoted to follow-up activities.

Components of Effective Training
• *Duration*: a series of workshops spaced over time. • *Scheme*: theory/demonstration/practice/feedback/coaching. • *Follow-up*: some form of structured interaction among participating teachers, whether peer coaching or study groups. • *Cadre*: a group of teachers who receive additional training and who can continue training when the outside consultants depart.

Effective Professional Development Is Collaborative

At present, most schools are organized in ways that isolate teachers from their peers. Teachers spend most of the day enclosed within the four walls of their classrooms. When they do interact with other teachers, it is usually on the most superficial level, over a quick sandwich during a half-hour lunch break, before they are off to their own classrooms again. (Dan Lortie's 1975 book *Schoolteacher* is cited as the most penetrating analysis of teacher isolation by almost everyone who addresses this issue, even 20 years later.)

However, professional development, like school improvement in general, needs to be a collaborative effort, the experts say. Each school needs to become a *community* in which teachers routinely have opportunities to participate in decision making, see each other in action, offer each other feedback, provide support and companionship, identify and solve problems together, do research together, and share ideas in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Even the most motivated individual teachers are unlikely to sustain innovations in their own classrooms without the support and participation of colleagues. The school as a whole is even less likely to improve without productive interactions among all, or at least most, teachers. "Creating collegial or collaborative working relationships," write Susan Loucks-Horsley and her colleagues, "is a vital strategy for supporting individual and organizational change" (Loucks-Horsley, Harding, Arbuckle, Murray, Dubea, & Williams, 1987, p. 8).

Unfortunately, breaking down isolation and fostering genuine collaboration is never easy. Norms of isolation run deep in many schools. As Michael Fullan (1990) points out, "One person's isolation is another person's autonomy; one person's collaboration is another person's conspiracy" (p. 14). Teachers may cherish their solitude because it gives them a territory to call their own, provides them with an opportunity to get work done, or shields them from unwanted scrutiny. Michael Hargreaves and Ruth Dawe (1990) have cautioned against what they call "contrived collegiality," in which superficial forms of collaboration are imposed by administrators upon a school culture that is still isolationist at heart (see also Grimmett & Crehan, 1992).

Although there are no guarantees, several types of collaborative activity have shown promise in encouraging teachers to work productively together, particularly if teachers are invited rather than forced to participate. Four of these have already been mentioned in earlier sections: (a) teacher involvement in designing and implementing professional development, (b) peer observation, (c) peer coaching, and (d) discussion groups. Two other activities that can promote collaboration are:

- Study groups: small groups of four to six teachers who investigate subject matter content, instructional methods, or other areas, support each other in implementing new initiatives, and study the effects on classroom instruction and student learning (Joyce & Showers, 1988; Joyce, Wolf, & Calhoun, 1993);
- Leadership teams: teachers and administrators (building and central office) who work with the faculty as a whole to identify and implement initiatives for school improvement (Joyce, Wolf, & Calhoun, 1993).

Teachers and administrators may also profit from training in skills that promote collaboration: group facilitation, consensus seeking, conflict management, participatory decision making, and the like (National Staff Development Council, 1994, p. 32).

Although collaboration within individual schools is essential to school-based professional development, teachers can also benefit from collaboration that extends beyond the boundaries of schools. This may be particularly true for teachers of specific subjects, in light of recent views holding that some effective teaching strategies are inextricably tied to the subject being taught. As Milbrey McLaughlin (1991) writes, "Good teaching practice in high school algebra, for example, entails choosing materials and techniques appropriate for teaching and learning quadratic equations as well as anticipating common student errors and assessing understandings. These skills and the knowledge base that supports them are different from the skills and knowledge necessary to teach literary analysis" (pp. 68-69; see also Shulman, 1987; Stodolsky, 1989).

One well-regarded form of collaboration is the collegial network, or collaborative, whereby groups of teachers from across the district, state, or nation join together in studying, developing, implementing, and discussing new approaches, often working together with university faculty members and representatives of the private sector (see Lieberman & McLaughlin, 1992; Little, 1993). Some collaboratives, such as the National Writing Project and the Urban Mathematics Collaboratives, are devoted to subject matter content and the instructional strategies that accompany such content. Others, such as the Coalition of Essential Schools and the Foxfire Teacher Outreach Network, focus on particular educational philosophies or instructional methods. Members of collaboratives attend workshops and conferences, publish newsletters, and exchange information through correspondence and computer networks.

The evolution of computer networks makes correspondence among teachers far removed from one another much faster and easier than ever before, whether it's part of an established teacher network or not. Through listservers, bulletin boards, and other formats, users can interact with hundreds or thousands of experts and peers from all over the world at the touch of a button, asking questions, sharing experiences, seeking advice, discussing issues, obtaining and providing information. One such network designed specifically for teachers is the National Education Association's School

Renewal Network, which, as NEA researchers Gary Watts and Shari Castle (1992) put it, "reduces teacher isolation by building communities of learners without regard to location" (p. 685).

Activities That Promote Collaboration in Schools

- Teacher involvement in designing and implementing professional development activities
- Peer observation
- Peer coaching
- Discussion groups
- Study groups
- Leadership teams
- Teacher networks
- Computer networks

Effective Professional Development Is Embedded in the Daily Lives of Teachers, Providing for Continuous Growth

A new concept of the productive employee is slowly emerging in some American business corporations. As layers of middle management evaporate, many frontline workers are being given more decision-making authority along with more responsibility for results. Workers accustomed to performing a single task over and over again for years may now be working in teams, making schedules, gathering and analyzing information, solving problems, monitoring results, and improving the production process.

Of course, this approach requires continuous training and retraining for workers. "High-performance work organizations require very large corporate investments in continuing education and training," write Ray Marshall and Marc Tucker (1992) in *Thinking for a Living*. "The successful firm is the firm that organizes itself as a learning system in which every part is designed to promote and accelerate both individual learning and collective learning--and to put that learning to productive use" (pp. 101-102). The Saturn company--one notable example--provided its original employees with more than 400 hours of training over their first few months, and every employee is still expected to devote at least 92 hours to training every year--almost 5% of their total hours, year after year (see Shanker, 1993).

If continuous learning is important for frontline workers in organizations that deal in things (cars, photocopy machines, home appliances), it is surely even more important for frontline workers in organizations that deal in the transmission of information and ideas--that is, for teachers in schools.

However, teachers not only aren't required to learn continuously in any significant way, but most of them do not even have the opportunity to do so. Indiana teachers do have to take six hours of approved college coursework (typically two courses) every five years or the equivalent in certification renewal units to renew their teaching licenses, and they generally get small salary increases for progress toward graduate degrees. In some districts, they also may be required to attend a day or two of inservice training each year. If they have funding and release time, they may have the opportunity to attend an occasional workshop or bring in a speaker. But it is a catch-as-catch-can system, left largely to the motivation of individual teachers and principals. Considering that teachers spend 25 to 30 hours a week in their classrooms, and many more hours preparing and grading, it is a wonder that they have the energy, much less the time, to continue learning.

If school improvement is to have any chance of success, the patchwork nature of professional development will have to change, experts say. Judith Warren Little (1993) calls for "adequate opportunity to learn (and investigate, experiment, consult, or evaluate) embedded in the routine organization of teachers' workday and work year" (p. 133). On the first page of *Student Achievement through Staff Development*, Joyce and Showers (1988) envision "a system that will embed professional growth opportunities into the work life of teachers" (p. 1). The very first standard listed in the National Staff Development Council's 1994 report on standards for staff development is "Continuous Improvement." By that they mean that "staff development cannot be confined to a few specific days in the school calendar, but must be viewed as an ongoing, job-embedded examination and development of new methods" (p. 7). In short, continuous learning opportunities need to become part of teachers' everyday working lives and part of every school's institutional priorities.

Continuous learning may require changes on the part of the school district, the school, and teachers. School districts might adopt a commitment to professional development in district policy. "Such a policy may be general," writes Betty Dillon-Peterson (1990), "but it should clearly commit the district--ideally through the board of education's mission statement--to an ongoing program of staff training" (p. 218). Districts may also establish a line item in their budgets for professional development, certifying their commitment in dollars and cents. And they must maintain this commitment in flush years and lean, not cutting professional development every time money gets tight. The overriding message in district policies, budgets, and routines must be that professional development is vital to school improvement.

School building administrators, in cooperation with district administrators, will have to provide resources and time during the school day and year for a variety of learning opportunities for teachers, including multiple workshops, peer observation, coaching, structured discussion, and research, among others (see the section on adequate time below for suggestions).

Finally, administrators and teachers alike will have to develop an *ethos of inquiry*--constantly examining their own practice; learning about subject matter, instructional methods, and student development; questioning what they learn in light of

their own experience; and thinking deeply about overall school improvement. As Joyce, Wolf, and Calhoun (1993) put it, "Teachers become reflective practitioners who continually expand their repertoire of tools and study the effects of these strategies on students" (p. 11).

The reflective practitioner attends traditional training workshops not to be spoon-fed information by an expert, but to be exposed to new ideas, to experiment with new practices, and to assess those practices in light of personal experience. As Georgia Mohlman Sparks and Joanne Simmons argue in a 1989 article entitled "Inquiry-Oriented Staff Development," trainers should encourage this approach, presenting research on teaching not as a prescription to be followed but as a tool to be tried, modified, studied, discussed, perhaps incorporated into a teacher's repertoire, perhaps not.

In fact, teachers are being encouraged to become researchers in their own right, rather than merely recipients of the research of others. Judith Warren Little (1993) extends "an invitation to teachers to act not only as consumers of research but also as critics and producers of research--to be participants in a more visible and consequential manner" (p. 143). One such form of research is called action research, defined by Emily Calhoun (1993) as disciplined inquiry conducted by teachers and administrators in an effort to improve the performance of schools. As action researchers, individual teachers, groups of teachers, or entire faculties:

- Diagnose problems in student learning or overall school performance;
- Search for solutions, (e.g., new teaching strategies), seeking information and technical assistance from the literature or from outside experts such as university personnel;
- Try out promising possibilities in the classroom;
- Monitor the results of the new approaches by developing and testing hypotheses, observing and recording student responses, collecting and interpreting quantitative or qualitative data;
- Discuss the results with each other, with outside experts, with parents, even with students.

If the new teaching strategy is not having the desired effects, teachers can modify it or try something else and begin the cycle again.

According to those who have studied action research (see, for example, Calhoun, 1993; Holly, 1991), this form of inquiry can revitalize a school, especially if done collaboratively. It can instill habits of reflection, problem solving, and collegiality among teachers. It can enhance teacher professionalism and morale by giving teachers the satisfaction of actively producing knowledge rather than passively consuming it. And it can serve as a model for students, as they see their teachers taking risks, working together to solve problems, and learning continuously.

Continuous Learning for Teachers

- Professional development needs to be *embedded* in the daily working lives of teachers.
- Professional development needs to be *ongoing*.
- Professional development needs to be *institutionalized* in district policies and budgets and in school procedures.
- Schools must provide adequate time and resources for extended learning opportunities for teachers, including multiple workshops, peer observation, coaching, discussion, and research.
- Administrators and teachers must develop on ethos of inquiry, constantly reflecting on their own practice, seeking new knowledge, solving problems, trying new approaches, and assessing the results.

Effective Professional Development Focuses on Student Outcomes and Is Evaluated at Least in Part on That Basis

All the rhetoric about how important professional development is to school improvement, all the theories about program design and coaching and peer observation, all the teacher involvement and action research and collaboration in the world ultimately give way to a single question: Is a particular professional development plan working?

To be more specific: Is professional development reinvigorating teachers? Is it expanding their repertoire and improving their abilities to teach? Is it leading to new roles and responsibilities for teachers within the school organization? Is it contributing to a richer, more positive school culture? *Most importantly, is professional development leading to more student learning, fewer discipline problems, more frequent attendance, or other improved student outcomes?* As Joyce, Wolf, and Calhoun (1993) put it, participants need to "continually study student learning and judge school-improvement initiatives by their effect on what students learn and whether students increase their capability as learners" (p. 21).

The only way to answer these questions with rigor is to conduct some sort of evaluation--not simply the standard five-point scale questionnaire used after so many inservice sessions, asking participants if the material was well presented, the visual aids useful, the speaker interesting, and the content relevant, but a multifaceted, long-term evaluation that examines professional development in detail and tries to determine its effects on teachers and students.

According to Thomas Guskey, Bruce Joyce, Beverly Showers, Dennis Sparks, and others who have conducted and studied evaluations of professional development, the most helpful evaluations begin early in the professional development planning process and continue after the particular professional development activity is completed, serving two related purposes: (1) they help inform and improve the

delivery of professional development, and (2) they document its effects, particularly on students (see Ayers, 1989; Guskey & Sparks, 1991; Joyce & Showers, 1988, chap. 9; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1987, chap. 6; Marshall, 1989; National Staff Development Council, 1994).

An ideal evaluation would include baseline data on students (e.g., test scores, grades, classroom involvement, attendance rate, discipline referrals, current attitude toward the school), teachers (e.g., current knowledge, current teaching skills, personal traits), and the school as a whole (e.g., policies, procedures, role of teachers in decision making, degree of collaboration among teachers). It would gather data on the implementation process, such as teacher involvement, types of training, and extent of follow-up. It would assess changes in teacher behavior and in the operation of the entire school. Most importantly, it would attempt to determine if student outcomes had improved. This kind of in-depth evaluation would require the use of many different instruments, such as questionnaires, interviews, observations, records and documents (i[illegible]olicies, minutes from faculty meetings, attendance and discipline records, lesson plans), achievement tests, student portfolios, and more.

Now, very few schools have the time, money, or technical expertise to conduct an evaluation of this sort, particularly when whole schools are involved rather than just a handful of teachers. Even if such an extensive evaluation is conducted, there is no guarantee that it will be able to separate out the effects of the professional development process from the effects of content, school culture, personalities of the teachers involved, and all the other factors involved in school change (see the section "Using Research to Inform Professional Development Practice" above).

Still, experts are convinced that some sort of evaluation process that (a) provides continuous feedback to teachers, (b) uses data, and (c) focuses in part on student outcomes is crucial to the success of professional development activities, whether it is conducted by an outside expert, the school system, or the teachers themselves. (In fact, it may be ideal for teachers to be involved in an evaluation, since this would serve as another opportunity for observation, reflection, and self-analysis.) For one thing, in this era of accountability in education, an external funding agent may demand an evaluation. For another, as Joyce and Showers (1988) point out, an evaluation--or at least the promise of such an evaluation during the planning phase--may help convince skeptical parents that time spent in professional development benefits children as well as teachers.

Finally, evaluating the effects of professional development on student learning may be the key to winning the support and participation of skeptical teachers. Common sense and some research suggest that teacher commitment to a professional development project is crucial to the success of that project. In other words, commitment precedes behavioral change. But some researchers have argued that for many teachers, the sequence is reversed; behavior changes first, then commitment follows. "We discovered commitment developing *after* implementation," writes David Crandall (1983), "after teachers were actively engaged in using a new practice" (p. 7; see also Guskey, 1986; Miles, 1983).

The key to the change in attitude, writes Thomas Guskey (1986), is evidence of student learning: "When teachers see that a new program or innovation enhances the learning outcomes of students in their classes . . . then, and perhaps only then, is significant change in their beliefs and attitudes likely to occur" (p. 7). Thus it is

crucial, he writes, that teachers "receive regular feedback on the effects of these changes on student learning" (p. 9). Feedback on student learning and other student outcomes, such as attendance or involvement in class, is precisely the kind of data that an ongoing evaluation can provide.

Evaluation of Professional Development

Professional development activities should be evaluated, experts say, and evaluations should:

- Document effects on student outcomes such as learning, involvement, attendance, and attitude toward the school;
- Document effects on teachers and the school as a whole;
- Begin in the early stages of professional development and continue after the activity has ended;
- Provide continuous feedback to teachers;
- Use a variety of data sources such as achievement test scores, student portfolios, questionnaires, interviews, and surveys.

Conditions for Effective Professional Development

Without the proper setting and support, even the best professional development initiatives undertaken by the brightest and most motivated teachers are in danger of withering on the vine. On the other hand, in a school where the principal is a strong advocate of continuous learning, where time is built into the schedule for professional development, where teachers routinely communicate with one other and solve problems together, where innovation is encouraged, where a clear and coherent strategy for overall school improvement prevails, and where policies and resources support change, the odds are high that most or all teachers will participate in and profit from professional development.

In short, conditions matter. As Loucks-Horsley and her colleagues (1987) write, "Availability of resources, flexible working conditions, support, and recognition can make all the difference in the desire of teachers to change their practice" (p. 7). The conditions most likely to influence the course of professional development initiatives are:

- Leadership
- Policy and resource support
- Norms of collaboration and experimentation
- Adequate time.

Leadership

The verdict is unanimous: Capable, active leadership on the part of policymakers, administrators, and other key actors is vital to the success of professional development projects--or of any school improvement projects, for that matter. On the other hand, indifference (or worse, outright hostility) on the part of leaders makes it extremely difficult for professional development initiatives to get under way, much less to be sustained during the first trying months of implementation or to be institutionalized after the initial enthusiasm fades away.

What does it mean for leaders--particularly principals, but also school board members, superintendents, department chairs, even key teachers--to support professional development? Among the most important characteristics of good leadership and support are the following:

- *Advocacy*: Good leaders place a high priority on professional growth, endorsing initiatives and encouraging teachers to improve continuously. Leaders, writes Milbrey McLaughlin (1991), "are primarily responsible for establishing the norms, values, and expectations essential to consequential professional development. This normative climate is not self-creating or self-sustaining; it requires school leaders to reinforce and encourage it. One way leaders accomplish this is by establishing professional growth and problem solving as a priority for the school, and by making it 'safe' for teachers to critically examine their practice and take risks" (p. 73).
- *Participation*: Principals who participate in professional development activities alongside teachers lead by example as well as encouragement and help break down barriers in status that may inhibit communication.
- *Assistance*: Good leaders try to remove administrative obstacles to professional development and seek resources for teachers in the form of money, materials, and--especially--time.
- *Pressure*: Good leaders do not operate exclusively in the realm of sweetness and light, but may have occasion to apply pressure to move complacent teachers forward. A teacher quoted approvingly by Judith Warren Little (1982) describes it as follows: "I'm not enough of a dreamer to think you're going to get a whole faculty behind something without a little coercion, a little polite coercion. And if you don't do that you don't ever have any growth in your faculty" (p. 336).
- *Problem solving*: As Joyce, Wolf, and Calhoun (1993) put it, "The most effective leaders do not simply follow established formulas for getting things done, but are effective diagnosticians, problem solvers, and leaders of others to find needs and create solutions" (p. 29).
- *Collegiality*: "Administrators exercise strong leadership by promoting a 'norm of collegiality,'" write Dennis Sparks and Susan Loucks-Horsley (1990), "minimizing status differences between themselves and their staff members, promoting informal communication, and reducing their own need to use formal controls to achieve coordination" (p. 19). This does not mean they do not exercise power when necessary, but that they respect the expertise of teachers, seek consensus when possible, discuss teaching and learning alternatives with

teachers, and establish planning committees and other formal structures for promoting teacher communication and input.

Resource and Policy Support

One of the most important forms of support has already been mentioned: leaders on the school and district level who show through their words, priorities, and actions that they champion the cause of continuous professional development for teachers.

Other forms of support are vital as well. One is the provision of adequate resources. Teachers in a school are well-placed to understand the problems of the students they teach; they also have talents important in overcoming those problems. Nevertheless, people and ideas from outside the school can play a critical role in school improvement as well. Thus, teachers need access to other resources such as research, examples of effective practice in other schools, the assistance of accomplished practitioners, and the creative ideas of experts in subject matter, instructional methods, and school organization.

Finally, just as professional development activities at the school level need to be integrated within the framework of a coherent school mission, so do policies and practices need to be coordinated at higher levels. "Only if staff development is embedded in the philosophy and organizational structure of schools and districts can a culture of continuous growth thrive," write Susan Loucks-Horsley and her colleagues (1987, p. 17). Policy coherence, or organizational alignment, as the National Staff Development Council (1994) calls it, can keep schools from being inundated with conflicting demands. As Joyce and Showers (1998) write, "District office personnel need to be well-coordinated so that the school is not deluged by initiatives made by departments that end up competing for the time of teachers" (p. 22). They tell of one district that handed down more than 40 initiatives to schools in a single year. If the state is also launching a multitude of time-consuming initiatives, the chances that a school will be able to carry out its own site-specific improvement and professional development process are slim.

Ideally, then, school, district, and state improvement plans are coordinated into a seamless whole targeted at increasing student learning, and the district and state have an infrastructure of policies and resources in place that support continued professional development on the part of teachers.

Norms of and Collegiality and Experimentation

There is no strictly logical reason for collegiality and experimentation to appear under the same heading. Since the appearance of Judith Warren Little's seminal 1982 article, "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success," however, the two terms have become so closely associated that they seem to be intertwined.

Little studied six urban desegregated schools (three elementary and three secondary) in an attempt to determine the organizational characteristics conducive to continuous professional growth on the job. She found that successful schools were characterized by (a) a collegial school culture and (b) a commitment to experimentation, or continuous improvement.

Simply put, collegiality means that teachers interact frequently with one another and with administrators. They prepare materials together. They observe one another in action. They help each other learn how to teach. They talk to one another frequently about teaching practices (rather than about the social lives of teachers, the failures of students, etc.), using a precise, concrete language. And this talk occurs not only through formal channels such as staff meetings, but in the halls, in the faculty lounge, in each other's classrooms.

Little is not the only researcher to note the importance of a collegial atmosphere in fostering professional development and school innovation. "Within the school," Michael Fullan (1982) writes, "collegiality among teachers as measured by the frequency of communication, mutual support, help, etc. was a strong indicator of implementation success. Virtually every research study on the topic has found this to be the case" (p. 121). In a recent five-year study, Milbrey McLaughlin and Joan Talbert (1993) found that the character of what they call "professional communities" of teachers and administrators heavily influences teachers' attitudes toward students, innovations, and professional development. "Those teachers who made effective adaptations to today's students had one thing in common," they write. "Each belonged to an active professional community which encouraged and enabled them to transform their teaching" (p. 7).

The other crucial norm cited by Little is the norm of experimentation. In successful schools teachers ceaselessly examine their teaching, experiment with new practices, and evaluate the results. They "view improvements in knowledge and practice as never ending" (Little, 1982, p. 339). And they are confident that the risks they take will be supported by colleagues and the administration.

The dilemma, of course, is how to cultivate norms of collegiality and experimentation in schools where they do not already exist. One answer: strong leadership. Another: professional development! This is one of those vexing circles that confound the study and practice of this topic. As noted above, one of the most important consequences of a good professional development initiative is collaboration among teachers. Another is commitment to continuous learning. Yet here collaboration and a commitment to continuous learning are characterized as *conditions* leading to successful professional development rather than results. Although they are talking about districts rather than schools, Joyce, Bennett, and Rolheiser-Bennett's (1990) comment is certainly apropos: "The irony may be that to persuade a school district to permit the necessary experimentation would itself require a change in the culture of the district" (p. 35).

Perhaps the circle is not as vicious as it sounds. If school leaders can acknowledge the importance of collegiality and take steps through professional development to overcome isolation, a few teachers may begin to build collegial relationships. This collegial base can then be expanded through the next round of professional development, and so on. The most important thing for administrators and teachers is to recognize the potentially debilitating effects of isolation and complacency and to begin taking steps to overcome them.

Adequate Time

Virtually every report on professional development turns sooner or later to the issue of time. Without adequate time for involvement in decision making,

collaboration, follow-up, continuous study, and evaluation, the odds that any professional development initiative will benefit teachers and students are low. But how can teachers find the time to engage in this kind of continual learning when their workdays are almost completely absorbed by teaching responsibilities? High school teachers generally get one period per day (50 to 55 minutes) outside the classroom for planning time, elementary teachers 30 to 45 minutes. Considering that high school teachers generally have three or four preps per day and up to 150 students, and that elementary teachers may have up to 10 preps, this planning time is more than absorbed by classroom responsibilities. Seldom is time scheduled to give teachers opportunities to plan or work together. On evenings and weekends, most teachers spend many hours preparing classes and grading assignments.

As part of school board policy or the collective bargaining contract, most school districts schedule a day or two of mandatory inservice training, often at the beginning of the school year. Frequently, however, inservice days are devoted to orientation and meetings rather than substantive growth opportunities. If professional development is on the agenda, it is usually of the one-shot workshop variety. Many districts also have policies whereby teachers can petition for available funds and release time to attend workshops or bring speakers to a school. As with inservice days, however, these opportunities are often limited to single workshops rather than ongoing activities.

Where, then, is the time for continuous, collaborative, schoolwide professional development with follow-up and evaluation going to come from? There are the summer months, of course, and many teachers use these months to take college classes or attend intensive, week-long institutes on some aspect of teaching. Valuable as these experiences may be, they are still discrete activities for individual teachers, and they place the onus on teachers to give up their own time rather than on the schools to build time into the regular school calendar.

Essentially, there are two options for increasing professional development time. One involves *adding time* to the school calendar. This option is discussed in detail in chapter 5. The other option is to make *more effective use of time within the school calendar*. The research literature offers a number of suggestions for reallocating time during the standard school day to make room for professional development (see, for example, Joyce & Showers, 1988, chap. 11; National Education Association, 1994; National Education Commission on Time and Learning, 1994; Purnell & Hill, 1992; Raywid, 1993; Sommerfeld, 1993):

- *Expanded staffing*: Schools can use substitute teachers to fill in for regular teachers engaged in professional development activities. Substitutes may be drawn from the district's substitute pool. Administrators also can serve as substitutes, as can parents and other volunteers from the community. Schools can hire floating substitutes who move from class to class. Schools also can hire extra teachers with regular assignments: specialists such as music or art teachers, part-time teachers, or shared teachers. Such teachers would provide the expertise and continuity that outside substitutes could not, and might ease some of the concern teachers have about being away from their classrooms.
- *Alternative grouping and programming*: Schools can regularly bring students together in groups larger than a single class, thus freeing one or more teachers.

Team teaching or joint presentations may free one teacher; regular schoolwide assemblies or community service by students can free an entire faculty.

- *Common planning time*: Schools can adjust the master schedule to give groups of teachers common planning time for collaborative efforts.
- *Extra periods*: Schools, particularly secondary schools, can add an extra period during the day without increasing teachers' class load, thus giving teachers an extra period for professional development. Of course, unless the length of the day is also expanded, this means less instructional time for students.
- *Block scheduling combined with teams*: Instead of scheduling the school day into rigid 50 or 55 minute periods, schools can put students in teams, each instructed by several teachers, and schedule large blocks of time for instruction in a variety of subjects. Teachers on the team have a common prep period. Also, while one teacher instructs the entire group in math or science or English, one or more of the other teachers may be able to use the time for professional development. (This approach also provides more flexible use of time to meet student needs.)
- *Banked time*: State policy permitting, schools can schedule a few extra minutes of instructional time per day above the required minimum, thereby accumulating enough time to occasionally dismiss students early and devote the time to professional development.

These are just a few of many options that imaginative administrators and school improvement teams can use, alone or in combination, to free teacher time. Some of them, such as common planning time, are virtually cost free. Others, such as expanded staffing, can be relatively expensive. Some of the options can be carried out without violating current state policy, district policy, or teachers' bargaining contracts. Others, such as block time or banked time, may require waivers from the state, district, or union (or changes in policy or the bargaining contract).

Whatever options they ultimately deploy to free teachers for professional development, administrators and policymakers need to bear in mind that effective professional development, according to experts, is schoolwide, collaborative, ongoing, and long term. One inservice day per year will have little or no effect on the growth of teachers. A half day once a week, or even once a month, together with regular time for observation, coaching, discussion, planning, and research, may help transform an entire school into a center of continuous learning for all.

An Indiana Example

The discussion thus far has focused on general principles of professional development and overall school improvement. An example of a school, district, or project that embodies most of the principles would be helpful at this point to show one form they might take in practice.

Since 1990, the Indiana Department of Education has funded a professional development project called CLASS (Connecting Learning Assures Successful Students). Developed by former elementary teacher Barbara Pedersen in 1989-90, CLASS synthesizes cooperative learning, social skills development, and thematic instruction in an attempt to transform schools into communities of lifelong learners.

Almost 150 schools have been involved with CLASS over the past five years. (For a comprehensive report on the first two years of the CLASS project, see Buechler & Vesper, 1993. For a shorter policy bulletin, see Buechler, 1993.)

The particular content of CLASS is of less interest here than its approach to professional development. In most schools where CLASS is adopted, teachers are heavily involved in the adoption decision. Thus, they have an opportunity to discuss the merits of the project, reflect on their own needs as individual teachers and as a faculty, and consider the vision of the whole school. In some cases, only a portion of the faculty ultimately decides to participate in CLASS. In other schools, such as Central Elementary in Lebanon, CLASS is adopted schoolwide. In this case, the whole faculty may attend training sessions together. Signs expressing the CLASS philosophy appear in the halls, cafeteria, and gym. Music, art, and physical education teachers may integrate their subjects into regular teachers' themes or develop their own themes. In short, the entire school is infused with the CLASS approach.

New participants are introduced to the theory and practice of CLASS through a series of three day-long training sessions, one in fall, one in winter, and one in spring. Between these sessions, follow-up discussion and coaching sessions are provided by a cadre of 30 coaches, each an experienced CLASS participant who continues to teach in the classroom as well as coach fellow teachers. There are also four full-time regional directors, also drawn from experienced CLASS teachers. Throughout the year, teachers have opportunities to observe formal demonstrations of teaching methods given by experts and to observe experienced CLASS teachers in other schools. There are also week-long sessions during the summer. Second- and third-year CLASS teachers have opportunities for advanced training on various aspects of the CLASS approach.

Throughout the training and coaching sessions, CLASS staff members encourage participating teachers to explore the ideas they are presenting, try them in the classroom, assess them in light of their experience, discuss them with other teachers, and modify or even discard them where necessary. The purpose is not to give teachers a set of ready-made practices to implement robot-like in their classrooms, but to provide them with a flexible set of strategies to adapt to their own needs, becoming more thoughtful about their practice in the process.

As teachers get deeper into the project, many begin to notice areas where they need additional training, such as whole language or learning styles. Many CLASS schools make funds available for teachers to continue training on their own. As teachers develop themes to knit the various strands of their curricula together, they recognize gaps in their own subject matter knowledge and begin doing research to fill those gaps. They begin plumbing their imaginations to devise new ways of presenting lessons and new types of assignments.

Teachers also begin talking to one another more often, not just in structured discussion sessions but in the cafeteria and the teachers' lounge. One teacher said, "I actually love going to the teachers' lounge now" because teachers are talking about exciting new developments and new ideas for themes instead of griping about the behavior of the children and the demands of the job. Conversations are made easier by the language that CLASS participants share (the language of themes, learning clubs, life skills, lifelong guidelines, choices, inquiries, enriched environment, and other terms familiar to anyone who has ever been in a CLASS school).

To encourage communication among teachers across schools, the CLASS staff sends out a monthly newsletter and also holds networking days for teachers from the same grade level across the state.

In short, the CLASS approach to professional development embodies a number of the principles of effective professional development discussed above. Particularly where it is adopted schoolwide, CLASS:

- Is based in the school rather than the district or the individual teacher;
- Involves teachers in decision making;
- Is integrated into a coherent school improvement plan that avoids fragmentation;
- Follows the theory/demonstration/practice/feedback/coaching scheme;
- Provides opportunities for classroom observation;
- Provides continuous follow-up, coaching, and support;
- Forms a cadre of experienced CLASS teachers who coach new participants while continuing to teach in the classroom;
- Fosters collaboration within and across schools;
- Presents theory and research as something to test, assess, and adapt, rather than as something merely to implement;
- Prompts teachers to become reflective practitioners and continuous learners as they implement new approaches and do research for their themes;
- Promotes the ultimate goal of turning schools into centers of continuous learning for all.

To be sure, the CLASS approach to professional development has not been flawless. Some early CLASS teachers reported that their initial training was too unstructured, for example, or that their second-year training was too repetitive. There are the perennial concerns about having to spend too much time away from the classroom and devote too much personal time to the project. And CLASS's specific approach to instruction is not likely to be appropriate for all students.

Overall, however, CLASS provides one of the best available examples in the state of the professional development of teachers. To quote from the Policy Center bulletin on CLASS: "Teachers are learning new things about the subjects they teach. They are re-examining past practices and developing alternative ones. They are taking more risks. And they are working together. The result is that they are starting to feel like professionals--something that has been a goal of education reformers for at least a decade" (Buechler, 1993, p. 4).

Chapter 4

Guidelines for State Policy on Teacher Time for Professional Development

Professional development means different things to different people. In public education, it has a wide range of legitimate purposes, participants, and supporting conditions, all of which are pertinent to state policy. Professional development may be undertaken, for instance, to inform those connected with schools about contemporary debates and public concerns, to apprise them of new governmental initiatives and policies, to alert them to current developments in subject matter and instructional methods, to improve their general capacities to perform their occupational roles, or to help them understand and undertake concrete improvements in the schools. Similarly, professional development is appropriate to school board members, support staff, administrators, and teachers. Finally, a number of factors are important to effective professional development, including leadership, research, technical assistance, and time.

This chapter and the next focus on a very narrow portion of the large landscape of professional development: how state policy in Indiana might make *teacher time* available for *school-oriented professional development*, that is, professional development directed to the concrete needs of individual schools. The reasons for this focus are several. First, an analysis of teacher time for professional development is the explicit charge of the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) contract that supports this study. Second, the research cited in chapter 3 suggests a strong connection between a school orientation for professional development and its effectiveness. And, third, *school-oriented professional development* has been relatively neglected in current state policy. While Performance-Based Accreditation requires schools to have a professional development plan, no state funding is currently provided. And although state certification rules require teachers to undertake self-selected continuing education for license renewal and most school corporation salary schedules give teachers incentives to take university courses, these policies do not systematically address the school-specific professional development needs of teachers.

Adequate time is a necessary condition for effective professional development. In analyzing how state education policy might make teacher time available for effective school-oriented professional development, this chapter considers the implications of the professional development research summarized in chapter 3. It delineates and justifies 10 general guidelines for state policy on teacher time for school-oriented professional development. Specifically, it considers how state policy on teacher time for professional development might define the purpose, scheduling, allocation, and use of that time.

Purpose: The *Why* of Professional Development Time

An effective state system of teacher time for professional development links state support to the improvement of local schools.

Guideline 1: State provision of teacher time for professional development should be based upon and integrated into local plans for school improvement in which teachers at the school have been involved.

This guideline derives from two sources: the research-based principles for effective professional development and the state's commitment to local school improvement.

Chapter 3 described effective professional development as school based and embedded in the daily lives of teachers. These principles imply in part that the typical model of professional development, where the content and occasion for teacher development are determined by external authorities and are perceived by teachers as an interruption of their real work, is mistaken. But more importantly, these principles imply, first, that teachers have a professional obligation to design and participate actively in activities that improve their capacities to meet the needs of their schools and, second, that school authorities have an equal obligation to create and maintain the conditions under which teachers can improve professionally. State provision of teacher time for professional development can play a critical role in allowing schools and teachers to meet these mutual obligations.

Chapter 3 also notes that effective professional development has a specific focus--the enhancement of student learning--and that it should be continuously evaluated for its effect on such learning. These principles suggest that school-oriented professional development should be aligned with school goals for students' personal and intellectual growth across their school careers. In Indiana, these goals are the cornerstone of the state's Performance-Based Accreditation system, where every five years schools assess their performance on the basis of state criteria and legal requirements, establish goals for improvement, and develop plans to achieve that improvement. Moreover, plans must include provisions for professional development to achieve the schools' goals.

Thus, there is a natural link between the characteristics of effective professional development and Indiana's school accreditation policy. That policy requires teacher involvement in establishing school goals for improved student learning. In turn, these goals provide a basis for designing and evaluating professional development in the school. State provision of teacher time to participate in the design of school improvement plans and the professional improvement activities that those plans include would enable the state not only to promote effective professional development but also to expand its support of the local school improvement process.

Combined, the research-based principles of effective professional development and the state's commitment to school improvement suggest that the overarching purpose of state-provided teacher time for professional development should be to enhance the design and implementation of local plans for school improvement--plans in which teachers are actively involved.

Scheduling: The *When* and *How* of Professional Development Time

An effective system of teacher time for professional development involves the flexible and planned scheduling of teacher time so that it can be used most productively to serve the purpose of local school improvement.

Guideline 2: Time for professional development that enhances school improvement should be provided on the job.

Guideline 3: The scheduling of teacher time for professional development should be flexible enough to provide opportunities before, during, and after the regular school day and school year, as local plans for school improvement necessitate.

Educators have waged a perennial debate about whether professional development is the responsibility of individual teachers acting on their own or of the schools and school systems that employ them. Often this debate ignores the different purposes that professional development may serve, ranging from maintaining the teacher's license to solving the concrete problems in the teacher's school and classroom. The previous section suggested that *for the purpose of local school improvement* professional development is a shared obligation of teachers and schools. Furthermore, because the focus of this type of professional development is the local school, it is logical that teachers will need time at the school to gather information, analyze problems, seek workable solutions, and test those solutions.

Thus, as Guidelines 2 and 3 suggest, teachers should be encouraged to view school-oriented professional development as an integral part of their job, and schools should be prepared to grant teachers the necessary time on the job to carry out those responsibilities. And although much current professional development takes place on days and in locations outside the regular school session, providing school-oriented professional development in this way would be more often than not inappropriate. Schools and teachers must be given the flexibility to schedule professional development focused on school improvement at times and places that are most likely to produce such improvement, including during the regular school day and year. Of course, some of this professional development might be most effective if scheduled off site--for example, to permit teachers to observe programs in other schools--or during evenings or the summer--for example, to permit teachers to work on school improvement plans with parents. But decisions about appropriate scheduling need to be made at the school. Therefore, state support for teacher time should permit local scheduling appropriate to the requirements of local improvement plans.

Guideline 4: The scheduling of teacher time for professional development should encourage participating teachers to work together to develop and carry out plans for school improvement.

Guideline 5: The scheduling of teacher time for professional development should maintain instructional coherence and continuity for students.

As chapter 3 reported, effective professional development is a collaborative rather than an individual task. This is especially true if the purpose of such development is the improvement of the entire school, not just the classroom performance of individual teachers. Some of the critical ingredients of effective professional development--such as peer observation, peer coaching, research teams, and program evaluation--require teachers to work with one another at the school site. Even when teachers work individually, for example, to conduct library research or off-site observations, they must have time to share and discuss their findings with colleagues at their school. Thus, schools must be prepared to schedule school-oriented professional development to permit teachers to work together to design, implement, assess, and revise school improvement plans and activities. And school principals and teachers will need to think creatively and flexibly about scheduling the entire school day and year to accommodate professional development. It may be necessary, for instance, to schedule all teachers of a particular grade level or subject to have time together during the school week for regular professional development sessions.

Thoughtful planning will be especially necessary in light of the need to ensure that student learning is not unduly fragmented or interrupted by scheduling professional development time during school hours. After all, the basic purpose of such development is the improvement of student learning. Thus, principals and teachers might consider, for example, using any funds provided to support teacher time for professional development to employ regular substitutes, part-time teachers, or teachers shared with other schools to allow teachers to work together during the school day. Therefore, rules about the use of such funds must be flexible enough to permit these arrangements.

Allocation: The *Who* of Professional Development Time

An effective state system of teacher time for professional development concentrates the inevitably limited time on the school improvement priorities of individual schools.

Guideline 6: Time for professional development should be targeted to projects and teachers where it is most needed for school improvement.

Guideline 7: The provision of time for professional development should permit sustained involvement of participating teachers.

In a real sense, every teacher needs and deserves time for professional development. All teachers need to keep up with recent developments in their disciplines, new approaches to teaching, public debates over the purposes and expectations for public education, and emerging information about the social, psychological, and economic conditions of their students. To an extent, certification renewal requirements and school corporation salary schedules provide incentives and opportunities, perhaps inadequate ones, for teachers to engage in this general sort of continuing professional education.

At the same time, however, the proposed purpose of state-supported professional development time suggests that those teachers who are willing and able to

be deeply involved in the complex work of improving their schools--work that usually extends well beyond the task of making their individual classrooms operate more effectively--ought to be given priority in the allocation of that time. The time commitment that these teachers must make is truly exceptional; a day or two a year spent by all the teachers in a school is simply inadequate, for instance, for the tasks of revising an entire school's instructional program, even in a single subject, or of establishing effective links with a community's businesses or social service agencies. Moreover, the research on effective professional development suggests that involvement must be sustained over a considerable time for teachers to make real changes in their schools and their teaching. A day now and then may be sufficient for teachers to become acquainted with fresh pedagogical or disciplinary ideas, but for teachers to assimilate and refine those ideas in their daily activities takes hard work, assistance, and above all the time to learn, experiment, modify, and assess the value of those ideas.

Any state policy must recognize that state and local resources to provide additional time for professional development are limited. In light of this reality, it is important to ensure that the limited time available be concentrated on the schools' priorities for improvement and, therefore, on those teachers who are willing and able to develop and implement successful programs and strategies to meet those priorities. Thus, the state provision of time for school-oriented professional development must not take the familiar form of doling out to all teachers the annual half-day or day of professional development to be taken at individual teachers' discretion. Instead, state policy must encourage the teachers and administrators in a school to allocate time to projects that serve the school's highest priorities for improvement and, therefore, to the teachers involved in those projects. And this time must be allocated in sufficient quantity and duration to enable those projects to succeed.

Such a strategy undoubtedly means that many teachers in a school will not be direct participants in state-supported time for professional development during a particular year. But it also means that all teachers are likely to benefit from school improvement projects that actually succeed in enhancing the environment of the school and the instruction in its classrooms. Moreover, as projects mature and change, all teachers in a school may have the opportunity to be involved in such activities during their service at the school.

Use: The *What* of Professional Development Time

An effective state system of teacher time for professional development permits and encourages the wide range of activities necessary to effect permanent and productive change in schools and their teachers.

Guideline 8: The appropriate uses of teacher time for professional development should be defined flexibly enough to meet the requirements of school improvement plans and the various elements of effective professional development, such as planning, instruction, practice, coaching, and evaluation.

Guideline 9: Time made available for professional development should be reserved for that purpose and thus be protected from utilization for the other manifold demands made on teachers.

A strong recent trend has emerged for states to specify in exquisite detail the ways in which schools may use the financial support that states provide for public schools. Against the familiar background of local autonomy in education and the stern public dissatisfaction with the educational results of that autonomy, state policymakers have sought to ensure that taxpayers' money be used for the purposes and programs that have been promised. Indeed, it has been suggested that state taxpayers' willingness to support additional funding for education depends upon state authorities' ability to hold schools accountable for specified educational processes and results. It is not clear, however, that this argument supports a narrow state definition of how teacher time for professional development may be used.

First, if the provision of this time is for the purpose of designing and implementing school improvement plans, there is already a state framework for regulating the goals and procedures of these plans that can ensure that the state's interest in professional development will be served. Under Performance-Based Accreditation, state statutes and State Board of Education rules specify the criteria according to which schools are to judge themselves and the procedures that are to be followed in developing plans to improve the schools' performance. Moreover, the State Board of Education must approve or disapprove these plans at least every five years. Thus, although the adequacy of these rules might need to be reviewed, they already establish basic state expectations for the effective use of state-supported time for professional development.

Second, local plans for school improvement are intended to address the specific needs of particular schools. Those needs vary according to the specific state criteria that individual schools are having difficulty in meeting, the characteristics of students and their families in those schools, and the talents of teachers employed by those schools. Thus, any state rule that limits the use of time for professional development to a particular content area or a particular development activity is likely to be irrelevant to the many schools whose priorities lie elsewhere within the broad scope of Performance-Based Accreditation.

Finally, the research on professional development suggests that many different types of activities are effective, indeed necessary, in improving school performance. Teachers must be involved in analyzing the conditions at their school and in planning improvements; they must have access to the research, training, and observation appropriate to making the improvements; they must have a chance to practice new techniques; they must have feedback on their efforts to change; and they must have a chance to evaluate and refine their efforts. Different schools are likely to be at different stages in this complex process of self-improvement. Thus, any state rule that limits the use of time for professional development to a particular stage of the process will likewise be irrelevant to many schools.

As long as state-supported time for professional development is thoughtfully scheduled and efficiently allocated, the state should permit its use for the wide range of activities related to the development and execution of school improvement plans. While it is important to ensure that time for professional development is not consumed

in activities not related to school improvement (routine clerical or supervisory tasks, for example), state rules intended to forbid inappropriate uses of professional development time should not be so prescriptive as to prevent the application of teacher time to the activities legitimately connected to school improvement.

Guideline 10: Additional support should be provided to make the use of teacher time for professional development most effective.

Time is a necessary condition for effective professional development, a condition that unfortunately current policies often ignore in their almost exclusive focus on defining the content and procedures of professional development. A state policy that redefines the legitimate role of teachers to include a responsibility for school improvement and that provides time for teachers to carry out this responsibility through professional development would place Indiana in the vanguard of thoughtful school reform.

However, it would be remiss for this report, despite its deliberate focus on the topic of teacher time, to fail to note that time alone is not sufficient for teachers to succeed in the task of school improvement. Although the recent research on professional development summarized in chapter 3 emphasizes teachers' active involvement in and personal commitment to their own professional growth, there is still a crucial role for others in and outside the school to play in providing the support, ideas, information, and help upon which that growth may depend.

Therefore, a comprehensive state policy for school-oriented professional development must consider how local teachers can gain access to the support needed to help them develop and carry out plans for school improvement that will have the desired effect. First, this support includes assistance in setting in motion an effective process of planning for school improvement and professional development. For example, teachers might need:

- Administrative leadership that encourages and supports them in redefining their roles to include a responsibility for school improvement;
- Knowledge of the principles of effective professional development;
- Assistance in establishing procedures for working collaboratively on school improvement plans and projects.

Second, teachers will need a supportive infrastructure that gives them information about and access to the specific resources necessary to carry out their plans effectively. Here, for example, teachers may need help in finding out about:

- Recent developments in subject matter knowledge both within and across the disciplines;
- Alternatives for reorganizing school and instructional time;
- Effective approaches to instruction.

In any case, this start-up assistance and supportive infrastructure will cost money beyond that required to provide teacher time for professional development. And state policymakers who seek to develop a system to provide necessary time for school-

oriented professional development should also consider how funding to support the most effective use of that time can be made available.

Overview of an Effective State System of Teacher Time for Professional Development

These 10 guidelines suggest how an effective state system of teacher time for professional development might work. Such a system would join the state, local schools, and their teachers in a coordinated effort at school improvement. Each school in the state would have an annual reservoir of teacher time made available by state support and thoughtful, creative scheduling at the school. Teachers would use that time to participate in the school community's identification of priorities for school improvement and then to work in teams over sustained periods on specific school improvement projects to meet those priorities.

While working on such projects, teachers could gather relevant research; observe at other schools using innovative approaches; receive instruction in subject matter, school organization, and teaching methods; experiment with and practice new techniques; give and receive feedback on their efforts to change their instruction; and conduct research on the effectiveness of their efforts in improving student learning. To enhance the work of the teams, teachers would have access to materials and individuals to provide them with ideas and assistance relevant to the school improvement projects.

Finally, as projects succeed and mature and as school improvement priorities evolve, other teachers at each school would become involved in professional development. Indeed, schools involved in the linked processes of school improvement and school-oriented professional development would become centers of continuous learning for both teachers and students.

Chapter 5

Assessing Indiana's Policy Options for Teacher Professional Development Time

The likely benefits of creating a system of teacher time for professional development are noted in previous chapters--its potential for redefining the role of schools and teachers to include a responsibility for continuous improvement, for enhancing the quality of local school improvement plans, and for supporting specific school improvement projects in local schools by concentrating the talents of teachers on those projects. These benefits suggest that the creation of such a system is a worthy subject of policymakers' consideration.

The discussions in this chapter are offered to help policymakers determine whether such a system is workable or whether the problems and complexities of creating and implementing that system might outweigh any benefits that its establishment might have. Other important aspects of policymakers' deliberations about such a system are not addressed, such as whether the provision of teacher time for professional development should be of higher priority than other state education and non-education programs.

In this chapter, several aspects of state policy are considered, including how basic policies might create a reservoir of teacher development time at each school, how that time might be funded, how the system might be regulated, and how supporting resources might be provided. Each section below articulates some of the major questions that are likely to be asked in establishing a statewide system of teacher time for professional development. The text spells out options for answering those questions and discusses to what extent the various options satisfy the guidelines suggested in chapter 4 as well as whether they are consistent with other state policies and policymaking patterns in Indiana.

Creating the Basic Structure of a System of Teacher Time for Professional Development

State policy to create a system of teacher time for professional development must consider how such time is provided within the instructional year, the system's relationship to Performance-Based Accreditation, the amount of time to be supported, and the entities to which that time should be allocated and by which it should be controlled.

Should the state provide time for professional development by redefining the school year or by simply requiring that a specific number of person-days be provided for professional development?

Options. One way for state policy to provide teacher time for professional development would be for the state to permit some, for example four, of the currently mandated 180 days of instruction to be used for that purpose, effectively shortening the instructional year to 176 days. A second option would be to lengthen the school year, for example to 184 days, and require that the added days, in this case four, be used for professional development. This option is similar to that proposed under the A+ initiative but not enacted by the General Assembly. A third option would be for the state to leave the current definition of the instructional year in place but to require that a specific number of person-days be provided for professional development, say four times the number of full-time equivalent teachers in a school or the entire school corporation. For example, a school with 50 teachers would be required to allocate 200 person-days to its teachers for school-oriented professional development; this time could be scheduled as needed for school improvement activities.

Discussion. The first option is problematic for two reasons. Most obviously, it reduces time available for student instruction, something that the General Assembly has consistently resisted since the school year was lengthened under A+ from 175 to 180 days. Both research and public opinion hold that instructional time makes an important contribution to student learning. Moreover, Indiana's current 180-day requirement is just at the level of most other states, neither exceptionally long nor exceptionally short. Today, there is revived concern over the potential academic advantage that the longer school years of many other industrialized nations may give their students. This option may also encourage schools and school corporations to follow traditional patterns of professional development that current research has called into question, namely, the provision of professional development for all teachers simultaneously outside the context of the school and its specific needs for improvement. As the guidelines suggest, effective professional development time should be provided not only on the job but also at the school site and, when appropriate, while school is in session so that certain important activities--such as observation, coaching, and evaluation--can take place. This option, however, would not provide funds to expand staffing to release other teachers while school is in session.

Adding days for professional development avoids the problem of shortening the instructional year, but like the first option, it lacks the flexibility necessary for the most effective scheduling of teacher time. The added days are likely to be perceived by teachers and administrators as time away from the teacher's basic role, not as time for activities that are central to that role. It will also be difficult under this option to schedule professional development while school is in session.

Requiring that a specified number of person-days be provided for professional development while leaving the instructional year unchanged solves both these problems. Clearly, no less time for student instruction is permitted. And the specified number of person-days is more likely to be perceived as a reservoir of time to be used for school improvement than time added to or subtracted from the instructional year.

The funds provided for professional development time can be used in a variety of ways for the sake of school improvement, not just for holding traditional staff development activities.

There are still certain problems with this option. One is that it may be much more complicated to hold schools accountable for the use of the specified time; the first two options require only that the school demonstrate that it was in session for the required number of instructional and professional development days. The third option will require an accounting for specific teachers' time involved in professional development activities.

Another related difficulty is that it may be harder for state policymakers to support and defend additional funding for additional person-days rather than additional days in session for professional development. Under the second option, the public can see that more work is being done for the additional taxes that they are paying; after all, teachers will be on the job for additional time. The third option will permit not only more work to be done but also more productive use of the time provided, but since some of that time will be will be spent during the regular school session or in the evenings as well as during non-instructional days, it may be harder to persuade the public that they are getting their money's worth. A potential consequence, then, of adopting the third option may be that, as with some other state mandates, the state may be willing to impose the requirement without providing additional funds to support it. This problem might be addressed specifically by permitting the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to calculate the number of person-days that would be available for a particular year according to the state appropriation for professional development time, much as happens now with the number of students who will receive ISTEP remediation.

These two problems, both of which are related to accountability, are not insoluble, but they do point to issues that will need to be addressed below in the section on regulation of the system. They also point to the need to help the public change its thinking about the responsibilities of teachers, so that work done outside the classroom to improve the school is perceived as important.

Should an independent program for providing teacher time for professional development be established or should that program be integrated with Performance-Based Accreditation?

Options. One way to create a system of teacher time for school-oriented professional development would be for the state to establish an independent program, with distinctive requirements for planning, monitoring, and reporting. A second option would be to incorporate the system within Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA).

Discussion. The first option would have some advantages. It would permit state policymakers to define the program without adjusting it to existing statutes, thereby avoiding the possible need to compromise desired features of the program to accommodate the requirements of PBA. Thus, this option would provide state policymakers with greater flexibility in designing the program. It might enable policymakers, for example, to choose alternative authorities to administer the program (the Professional Standards Board, for instance, instead of the State Board of

Education) or alternative schedules for implementing the program (a three-year cycle, say, instead of the current five-year PBA cycle). This option might also make it easier to estimate state administrative costs for the program since a new administrative unit might be required.

At the same time, creating an independent program has certain drawbacks. The guidelines suggest that state provision of teacher time for professional development should focus on school improvement; an independent system would be difficult to link to the state's existing school improvement strategy included in PBA. Moreover, an independent system would impose distinct and probably higher planning and administrative costs on both the state and schools.

Tying teacher time for professional development to PBA seems natural, given the strong connection between the principles of effective professional development and the school improvement goals of PBA. This option might also encourage the state to adapt the person-day requirement to the needs of PBA. For example, more professional development time might be provided to schools in the year that they are preparing their self-studies and proposed five-year school improvement plans. Similarly, schools put on probation by the State Board of Education might be provided with additional professional development time to allow needed work on the schools' improvement plans.

If the teacher professional development time system is integrated into PBA, state policymakers, including the State Board of Education and IDOE officials, will need to review carefully current PBA requirements and procedures to make sure that they are fully compatible with the new system. For example, state guidelines for the PBA school improvement plan would have to apply to all schools in the state so that each school's professional development plan could be keyed to the locally identified priorities for school improvement. Similarly, the state's procedures for developing school improvement and professional development plans would have to ensure active participation by the school's teachers. In addition, the state's guidelines for these plans should be comprehensive, ensuring that all issues relevant to school improvement are considered as the plans are developed. In a real sense, then, PBA would generate a five-year master plan for each school. To prevent duplication of effort, the state should consider integrating the planning requirements for its other school-wide programs, such as Indiana 2000 and Re:Learning, into the PBA planning requirements.

Nevertheless, it is important to note one significant potential problem with this option. PBA has become a known and familiar part of school and school corporation operations, particularly now that all school corporations in the state have participated in it. Changes in PBA might disrupt existing plans and operations in schools and in the IDOE. Thus, it will be important to minimize the extent of the changes in PBA caused by incorporating a system of professional development time for teachers so they will not interfere unduly with current school improvement efforts. It may be advisable, therefore, to keep statutory amendments to PBA to the minimum necessary to create the basic system and to indicate the state's expectations for that system. The State Board of Education could be authorized to design the details of the system and its implementation by amending the state's Administrative Code. And, if necessary, the State Board could later request additional modifications of PBA statutes to permit the implementation of the system that it designs. This strategy is similar to the

General Assembly's approach to making modifications in PBA necessitated by the substitution of the new state student assessment system for ISTEP.

How much teacher time for school-oriented professional development should be provided?

Nothing in the research reviewed in chapter 3 suggests a uniform amount of professional time per school or teacher as being optimally effective. In fact, the conclusion to which such research leads is that the time provided should be proportional to the need for it to enhance school improvement. Under such circumstances, it may be best to determine what amount of time the state budget might be able to support and to consider how that time might be most appropriately allocated to schools. The review of other state policies in chapter 2 reveals that those making the greatest efforts to provide teacher time typically make four or five person-days available annually per full-time equivalent (FTE) teacher in the system. Perhaps this number might be a target for which Indiana might aim.

Options. One way to begin the system of teacher time for professional development, then, would be for the state to fund four person-days of time for each full-time equivalent teacher in the state's schools. Based on an estimated 54,000 teachers in the state, this option would mandate the provision of approximately 216,000 person-days of professional development time to Indiana's schools. Using an estimated $37,000 annual salary for the current 180-day school year, each person-day would cost about $206. In total, this option would cost approximately $44.5 million per year, or about 1.6% of the state's current general fund appropriation for K-12 education. If state and local budget constraints do not permit the provision of that amount initially, the state might consider a staged program, in which the number of days is increased over several years. For example, the state might allocate one person-day per FTE teacher in the first year and increase that amount by an additional person-day in subsequent years until the target of four person-days is reached.

As discussed above, state policymakers might want to consider a second option of providing different levels of teacher time depending upon the circumstances in schools. For example, five person-days per full-time equivalent teacher might be provided to schools on probation and schools in the year they must prepare their self-studies and school improvement plans; other schools could be provided three person-days per full-time equivalent. Assuming that one fourth of schools would receive the higher allocation and three fourths the lower allocation, this option would mandate approximately 189,000 person-days of professional development time statewide, with an estimated cost of $38.9 million per year, or about 1.4% of the state's current general fund appropriation for K-12 education. It would be possible to stage the implementation of such a plan over several years as well. For instance, the state might provide two person-days for designated schools and one person-day for other schools in the first year; three person-days for designated schools and two person-days for others in the second year; four days for designated schools and three for others in the third year; and five days for designated schools and three days for others in the fourth year.

The costs of the various options for staging the implementation of the program are included in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1
Estimated Costs of Professional Development Time Options

Estimates are based on the following assumptions:

1. There are 54,000 FTE teachers in the state.
2. The average annual teacher salary is $37,000, making the average daily teacher salary $206 (based on a 180-day school year).
3. 25% of schools would be either in their PBA year or on probation.
4. PBA and probationary schools will receive no fewer professional development days per FTE than other schools.

Days That Non-PBA and Non-Probationary Schools Receive per FTE	Days That PBA and Probationary Schools Receive per FTE				
	5	4	3	2	1
5	$55,620,000				
4	$47,277,000	**$44,496,000***			
3	**$38,934,000***	$36,153,000	$33,372,000		
2	$30,591,000	$27,810,000	$25,029,000	$22,248,000	
1	$22,248,000	$19,467,000	$16,686,000	$13,905,000	$11,124,000

* Numbers in bold represent the costs of the two major options discussed on p. 53.

Discussion. Two issues need to be discussed in considering these alternatives. The first is whether all schools should be provided a uniform number of person-days for professional development or whether certain categories of schools should receive more than others. Uniformity seems to ensure that all schools will be treated fairly. Yet this may be more apparent than real. Many state policies recognize that fair treatment often requires that the needs of a school be taken into account. Thus, school corporations with more special education children or high levels of at-risk factors receive more state assistance. On this view of fairness, taking into account schools' needs for teacher time allocated to professional development for school improvement seems reasonable. The two factors mentioned, probationary accreditation status and preparation of the school improvement plan, are likely to be widely accepted as a legitimate basis for varying schools' eligibility for professional development time. The first indicates a greater need for improvement according to state standards and the second a greater need for planning time in addition to time for teachers to work on school improvement projects. Thus, this approach would adhere to the guideline of allocating teacher time where it is most needed for school improvement. At present the IDOE has limited funds to provide technical assistance to probationary schools.

The provision of additional professional development time to these schools would be simply a logical extension of current policy.

The second issue is whether it is reasonable to stage the implementation of a system of teacher time for professional development over a number of years. As noted, this may be necessary because of budgetary contingencies. Such a staged implementation seems preferable to two other possible responses to budgetary limitations--a decision to do nothing and a decision to implement a limited program for only a year or two. The importance of teacher time to school improvement suggests that a limited start would be better than nothing. However, a program that is slated to last only a year or two and to provide minimal support for teacher time during that period may be a waste of resources. A staged plan would at the very least allow schools to take into account statutorily provided higher levels of assistance later in their school improvement plans and encourage them, therefore, to make those plans more ambitious. And such an approach would provide teachers with some assurance that the system of teacher time for professional development will endure, encouraging them to redefine their roles as including the responsibility for school improvement and making it worth their while to build teacher time for professional development into their long-term plans for the school.

Should time for professional development be allocated to and controlled by the school or the school corporation?

Options. One way of establishing a system of teacher time for professional development would be to allocate the total number of person-days for professional development to school corporations and to permit them to allocate those days in turn to individual schools and projects, according to criteria developed by the school corporation. A second option would be for the state to allocate teacher time to individual schools directly.

Discussion. Two aspects of the suggested guidelines seem to point to different options. Since teacher time is to be allocated to the areas of greatest need, allocation to school corporations might permit them to target more professional development time to especially needy schools and to support projects deemed to be most important to the entire community. However, the guidelines also suggest that teachers in all schools, not just the needy ones, should understand and carry out school improvement as central to their basic role. In this light, professional development time should be allocated to individual schools so that they can all have at least some of the resources necessary to participate actively in school improvement. On balance, this second consideration seems more important, especially if the state system of allocating teacher time already recognizes certain needs and permits some opportunity for school corporations to request that schools transfer their time to other schools in special need.

The guidelines for state policy are based on the premise, drawn from the research summary, that the effectiveness of professional development depends upon the willingness and opportunity that those at the school level have to undertake the difficult tasks of individual and organizational advancement. For that reason, the guidelines consistently emphasize teachers' collective responsibility for active involvement in the improvement of their schools. If the responsibility for

improvement is to fall squarely on teachers, so too must the authority to allocate time to carry out that responsibility. However, allocating time for professional development to school corporations would inevitably place the basic responsibility for professional development with central administrators and school boards. School corporation planning and priority development, no matter how well carried out, would displace teacher participation at the school level and would therefore militate against teachers' active involvement in school improvement so critical to the effectiveness of professional development. Moreover, the state policy outlined above that would provide additional professional development time to certain schools would already tend to concentrate state resources on schools with the greatest needs and render school corporation involvement in time allocation less necessary.

If schools' strategies for using time for professional development are part of their PBA school improvement plans, local school boards could review those strategies in the process of approving the plans. Thus, local boards would be made aware of and could object to strategies they find inappropriate. Nevertheless, it is important to place the initial responsibility for planning the use of professional development time with individual schools by allocating such time to the schools themselves. Finally, state policy might permit schools voluntarily to transfer allocated time to other schools within the corporation if teachers within the school could be persuaded that the needs at the receiving schools were of sufficient importance.

Funding Teacher Time for Professional Development

State policy to create a system of teacher time for professional development must consider whether state or local funding of teacher time would be most appropriate, whether state funds provided for teacher time should be dedicated to that purpose, whether state assistance should be calculated using state average or local costs, and whether localities should be required to maintain current levels of funding for teacher time.

Should funding teacher time for professional development be a state or local responsibility?

Options. If state policy does require a specified number of person-days to be devoted at each school to professional development for school improvement, some source of funding to support that time will have to be identified. For if, as recommended above, the state does not modify its instructional year to accommodate the required professional development time, that requirement will impose real costs on schools, estimated above at $38.9 to $44.5 million. One option would be to expect local school corporations to pay the costs out of their current state and local base tuition revenue. A second option is for the state to provide additional funds to cover those costs. A third option is for the state to require a specified sharing of costs by the state and local school corporations.

Discussion. Imposing a teacher professional development time requirement without state funding is likely to undermine the effectiveness of that requirement. School corporations could do one of two things in response to this situation; either

they could simply extend teachers' school year without compensation, or they could cut other basic instructional expenses to provide funding for teacher professional development time. The first response would not only create resentment among teachers and lead to statewide difficulties in negotiating teacher contracts, but it would also be equivalent on the local level to a redefinition of the school year. As explained above, simply lengthening the school year to provide additional days for professional development does not afford the sort of flexibility and creativity in scheduling teacher time necessary for effective professional development. Thus, if school corporations extend the teacher school year, much of the potential value of the state requirement would be undermined. It should be noted that the state's current policy of permitting schools to bank time for non-instructional activities by extending the school day does not relieve these difficulties. For at best that policy provides additional half-days for professional development when students are dismissed early; it does not permit flexibility in scheduling teacher time for professional development within the regular school day. Moreover, banking time to provide professional development would not alter the fact that school corporations that extend the teacher school year would still be asking teachers to work more for the same salary.

If school corporations respond by cutting other instructional expenses to cover the costs of mandated professional development time, a similar result would occur. For while teachers might have more time for developing and carrying out school improvement projects, they would have fewer resources of other kinds with which those projects could be accomplished. Thus, state funding of required person-days for professional development seems necessary for that requirement to be optimally effective in enhancing school improvement.

The third option, which would require local schools and the state to share the costs of the mandated professional development time, would face both of the problems mentioned above. It would force school corporations to choose between extending the teacher school year or cutting other instructional expenses, both of which would undermine the effectiveness of the professional development time mandate. Only the second option, then, in which the state bears the full costs of the mandate, would maintain full effectiveness of the policy.

Should state funding for teacher time be dedicated to that purpose only, or should funding be provided without a strict requirement for its use?

Options. One way for the state to fund time for professional development would be to deliver a specific number of dollars to schools that may be expended only for this purpose. A second option would be for the state to deliver additional funds to assist schools in meeting the person-day mandate but not require schools to use those funds only for teacher development time.

Discussion. The general practice in Indiana is for the state not to dedicate most of the funds made available to schools. The base state and local tuition, which forms the largest part of school corporations' revenues, is not dedicated to specific operating expenses, although it cannot be used to pay for capital improvements and transportation. Even the three largest categorical programs--special education, vocational education, and Prime Time--do not dedicate funds for specific purposes.

Instead, these programs deliver funds to schools designed to assist them in meeting the mandate to serve particular students or in operating particular programs. Thus, for example, although the state delivers a certain number of dollars for each child with a disability, it does not require school corporations to demonstrate that they have expended those dollars only on the education of those children. Only smaller programs, such as At-Risk, ISTEP remediation, and preschool special education provide dedicated funding. Thus, there is a strong tradition in the state against dedicated funding.

Furthermore, some argue that dedicated funding is inefficient for at least two reasons. First, it is thought to impose higher administrative costs on school corporations and state agencies because it requires them to account for those revenues and expenditures separately. Second, it is thought to deprive school corporations of the incentive to use their funds most efficiently. For example, even if a school could meet the person-day requirement for less than the state provides, dedicated funding would give it no incentive to do so. Non-dedicated funding would encourage schools to reduce their costs of meeting the person-day requirement so that additional money could be made available for other purposes.

Nevertheless, there are at least two difficulties in non-dedicated funding of state mandates. First, it may permit and perhaps even encourage the state to underfund the mandate. Many school corporations suggest that this has happened with special education, although definitive evidence is lacking to support this claim. These school corporations maintain that state special education funding does not adequately pay the additional costs that a school corporation incurs for special education; because the mandate for special education is not tied to adequacy of state funding, the state has no incentive to provide adequate funding. Because school corporations must provide special education services, funding for other programs in the school, it is claimed, must be reduced. Non-dedicated funding of a professional development time mandate might similarly allow the state to provide significantly less state funding than schools might need to carry out that mandate. Second, non-dedicated funding may give schools incentives not just to minimize costs but also to minimize quality of services or programs. In other words, schools might seek to save money by choosing less effective and cheaper ways to provide teacher time for professional development. For example, they might choose to employ only substitutes rather than part-time or shared teachers to release other teachers for professional development activities, but substitutes may be less effective in maintaining continuity of instruction for students. This may be especially likely to happen at the inception of a program, where schools might seek to minimize the costs of an unfamiliar program to have more funds to expend on programs already in operation.

This analysis suggests that there is a complex tradeoff between adequate state funding of a mandate and effective achievement of the purposes of the mandate, on the one hand, and efficient local use of that funding, on the other. If the state does initiate a system of teacher time for professional development, the state's first priority is probably to encourage schools to develop effective ways of using that time for school improvement, even if some inefficiencies are incurred. Thus, at the beginning of such a system, it may be best to dedicate state funds to it. Once schools have developed effective uses for those funds, the state may wish to consider deleting the requirement that those funds be dedicated to encourage schools to be as efficient as possible in

their use of the funds. But even then, the possibility that the amount of state funding might become less adequate once the dedication is removed should be considered. In fact, the state may wish to make the person-day mandate contingent upon state funding as it has with several other programs, such as ISTEP remediation and At-Risk.

Should state funding for teacher time reflect local or average state costs?

Options. One way for the state to fund teacher time for professional development would be to deliver to the school an amount of money equal to the number of mandated person-days times the average daily salary of a teacher in the state as a whole. A second option would be for the state to calculate school funding based upon the average daily salary of teachers in that particular school corporation.

Discussion. Using the state average teacher salary would have at least two advantages. First, it would greatly simplify state and local calculations of funding. All schools would need to do to determine the funds available to support teacher time for professional development would be to multiply their teacher FTE by a predetermined state factor. Using a local average would require a complex calculation at the school corporation level and the approval of that calculation by the state. Second, using the state average would provide equal funding per FTE for professional development to all schools no matter where they are located. To a real extent, average teacher salaries in specific school corporations reflect historic inequalities in the revenues that the state makes available to those corporations. It is not clear that it is fair to make the funding of teacher professional development time depend on those inequalities, as would happen if local averages were used.

On the other hand, local averages do represent the real costs that schools are likely to face in making the mandated person-days available. If the state average is used, schools in high salary school corporations might have to choose lower-cost ways of providing teacher time, such as using substitutes instead of part-time or shared teachers. However, these schools are also more likely to have additional funds available to supplement dedicated state funds.

The guidelines for state policy and the research on effective professional development alone do not provide a clear resolution to this dilemma. They encourage schools to make necessary teacher time available during the school day in ways that maintain instructional coherence and continuity. Employment of part-time and shared teachers may be one good way to do this. At the same time, the guidelines imply that all schools in the state have an equal claim on the benefits of teacher time applied to school improvement. The simplicity of using state averages may make it an attractive way to get such a program off the ground. However, state policymakers may wish to consider how such a plan would fit with their current strategies for equalizing school spending across the state.

Should state funds for professional development time be permitted to displace currently provided local funds?

Options. Since some school corporations already provide teacher time for professional development, the state might choose to require those corporations to

maintain current levels of support for teacher time in addition to the person-days mandated by the state. Optionally, the state might impose no such requirement on local schools or school corporations.

Discussion. Some critics of state involvement in education allege that state minimum requirements often become maximums, for instance, that state minimum testing standards for students encourage students and schools to be content with a minimally satisfactory performance. If this is true, a state requirement for a specific number of person-days devoted to professional development at each school might be regarded as sufficient even though additional time might be beneficial. One way to overcome this problem, if it exists, would be for the state to require schools to maintain current levels of professional development time over and above the state mandate.

This seems like an especially inappropriate solution, however. For it would have the effect of punishing schools and school corporations that have already discovered the value of school-supported professional development and rewarding those that have not. Furthermore, it would be difficult to articulate and administer such a requirement fairly. For example, would a school that loses enrollment and teachers still have to maintain previous numbers of person-days for professional development?

The state's interest in supporting a system of teacher time for professional development is to ensure that all schools have available to them the time and talents of their teachers to be utilized for school improvement. It is not obvious that a requirement to maintain previous levels of professional development time contributes to the goal of school improvement. After all, the optimal amount of teacher time is not necessarily the sum of a new state mandate and the amount now provided locally. Thus, such a requirement seems unnecessary. Without it, school corporations and teachers can still decide whether additional teacher time for professional development beyond the state mandate is important to the progress of local schools.

Regulating Teacher Time for Professional Development

State policy to create a system of teacher time for professional development must consider what formal mechanisms might be put in place to ensure local schools' effective use of mandated person-days for professional development and the state funding that supports them.

What form should school plans for using time for professional development take, and what criteria should be used in approving them?

Options. If, as recommended above, the system of teacher time for professional development is adopted as part of Performance-Based Accreditation, it would be natural for schools to develop their strategies for using that time as part of the school improvement plans. One option would be for the state to require a detailed school plan for this time where the teachers who would use the mandated person-days and the activities in which they would be engaged would be specified precisely. A second option would be to permit a more general plan in which the school could

demonstrate that it satisfies the guidelines for state policy without providing precise details about its use of the time.

Discussion. On the one hand, state regulation of the system of teacher time should both hold schools accountable for appropriate use of state resources and provide them sufficient guidance so that they will use teacher time effectively. On the other hand, state regulation should not be so strict that schools will either find the costs of meeting the requirements to exceed the benefits of having access to state-funded teacher time for professional development or find themselves without sufficient flexibility to respond to the opportunities for school improvement that present themselves as their efforts evolve.

Requiring detailed plans for using teacher time is likely not to meet either of these standards. In developing such a plan, teachers and principals might find themselves focusing more on the logistics of using teacher time than on the purposes and strategies for using that time effectively. In a sense, detailed planning might be less effective in maintaining accountability than more general planning. In addition, effective professional development is likely to change teachers' understanding of the school improvement projects on which they are working, since such professional development enables teachers to gain access to new ideas and possibilities for change. Thus, detailed advance planning is in some ways antithetical to effective professional development.

The alternative of having schools develop what might be called a strategic plan for using professional development time might be more appropriate, then. Such a plan might be keyed to chapter 3's principles for effective professional development and chapter 4's guidelines for professional development policy. Thus, it might include:

- An explanation of how teachers were involved in developing the school improvement plan and the strategies for using teacher time;
- An identification of the specific school improvement projects for which teacher time will be used and an explanation of how those projects reflect the school's highest priorities for improvement;
- An explanation of how the available time will be concentrated on those specific projects to permit sustained involvement of participating teachers;
- An outline of the strategy that the school will use to schedule teacher time so that instructional continuity will be maintained and so that teachers can work together on school improvement projects and have access when necessary to time while school is in session;
- An explanation of how any training elements of the plan will include theory, observation, practice, and follow-up activities;
- An explanation of how involved teachers will obtain feedback about the success of school improvement projects in enhancing student learning and how that feedback will be used to strengthen those projects;
- An indication of the additional resources that will be available to teachers to help them carry out the school improvement projects.

A plan of this kind would encourage school principals and teachers to develop a thoughtful strategy for using teacher time that reflects the major conclusions of the research on effective professional development.

In turn, an IDOE review and State Board of Education approval of the plans might also utilize criteria based on the principles of effective professional development and the policy guidelines:

- Have teachers been adequately involved in planning for professional development?
- Do plans for professional development reflect the school's priorities for improvement?
- Will teacher time be allocated to permit a concentrated and sustained effort on projects to achieve those priorities?
- Will teacher time be scheduled to permit teachers to work on school improvement projects collaboratively?
- Will teacher time be scheduled to maintain instructional continuity?
- Will training include opportunities for observation, practice, and follow-up?
- Will feedback about the effect of professional development on student learning be obtained and used effectively?
- Will teachers have adequate access to resources that enhance the likelihood that those projects will succeed?

A strategic plan such as that outlined above coupled with the suggested state review of that plan would serve the state goal of ensuring accountability in the use of state resources. Such a process would give schools guidance about the effective use of teacher time for professional development and permit the State Board of Education to ask schools to amend and improve plans that do not show adequate attention to the state criteria. At the same time, this process would promote reasonable flexibility for schools to tailor those resources to the local needs for school improvement.

Should schools be required to report on the use of teacher time between five-year PBA cycles?

Options. Because for most schools PBA reports and plans are submitted every five years, it may be felt that, if state funding is provided for teacher professional development time, more frequent reporting is necessary. One option for more frequent reporting would be to include within the required annual fiscal and performance reports a section on local participation during the past year in the state system of teacher time for professional development. Another option would be for the state to require schools to submit a separate update of their plans for using teacher professional development time every year or two.

Discussion. If the system of professional development time involves the granting of state funds, those funds will be included in the overall annual fiscal report that school corporations make to the public and the IDOE. If the state chooses to designate those funds for professional development only, it will be necessary for school corporations to account for those funds separately; therefore, it should be

possible and would probably be desirable for school corporations to report to the state on the receipt and expenditure of such funds as a separate category within the larger fiscal report. This sort of fiscal reporting seems entirely consistent with the state's requirements for financial accountability and is not likely to impose a significant burden on school corporations.

However, the fiscal report does not indicate exactly at which schools and for what purposes the funds were used. This information could be reported on the annual performance report ("school report card") that school corporations must publish for each school and for the corporation as a whole. For example, these reports might indicate for each school the total number of person-days required to meet the state mandate, the number of person-days paid for with designated state funds, and, perhaps, the number of person-days paid for with other funds. In addition, individual schools might be asked to list in their performance reports the school improvement projects supported by teacher professional development time.

These additions to the fiscal and performance reports should, however, be kept to a minimum to ensure that they do not impose an undue burden on schools. It might be best, for example, to request only that information necessary to enable the state to determine that the person-day mandate and funding designation requirement have been met. Perhaps, a few additional items that might be of particular value in the IDOE process of reviewing future PBA school improvement plans or that might be of special interest to the public could be included in the performance report, but once again these should be restricted to items that schools can collect and report easily. Rather than collecting these additional items annually, the state might consider asking schools to report on them for the last five-year period in their PBA self-study and school improvement plan.

Providing Other Resources to Enhance the Use of Teacher Time for Professional Development

State policy to create a system of teacher time for professional development must consider how teachers can gain access to needed additional resources to make the best use of the time they have for school-oriented professional development.

It should be said that this discussion is not intended to be a complete treatment of the more general issue of how the state might provide access throughout teachers' careers to resources beyond time for professional development at their schools. Rather, the questions addressed are those that seem most relevant to the use of teacher time for professional development to improve local schools. Many other considerations beyond the scope of this report are relevant to the general issue of teacher access to other professional development resources, such as how initial teacher education should be conducted and what continuing formal education should be expected of teachers. Finally, this section does not discuss in detail how the state might decide between supporting teacher time or access to other professional development resources in the event that funding is insufficient to do both. Ideally, both should be provided, but the need for time seems especially conspicuous, given its potential for producing significant change in schools and the manifold intellectual and professional talents that teachers themselves bring to the task of school improvement.

Still, the question of the relative priority of time and other resources requires more research, deliberation, and debate than is possible here.

Should the state or the school corporation provide resources beyond time to support professional development?

Options. One way of providing resources beyond teacher time for professional development that teachers need for school improvement would be for the state to provide funds to secure those resources. A second option would be to require local authorities to provide a minimum level of additional resources. A third option would be to leave the provision of these resources entirely to the discretion of local school authorities.

Discussion. Support for school improvement and teacher professional development is a joint responsibility of the state, school corporations, and teachers themselves. Establishing a state-funded program of teacher time for this purpose would clearly make a major state investment in meeting its responsibility. If additional state funds were available, it might be worthwhile for the state to support the other resources that teachers need. But if such funds are not available, it is reasonable to expect local authorities to do their part to support the system.

The harder issue is whether and how the state should use its authority to make these additional local resources available. The improvement priorities of schools and the professional development needs and opportunities of their teachers are so various that any uniform state requirement for local funding is likely to be wildly off target in a large proportion of school corporations. Perhaps the best short-run solution is to require the school improvement and professional development plans mandated under PBA to indicate how the additional resources that teachers need at their schools will be provided without mandating any specified level of local support. At least this would mean that school corporations have to discuss this matter with their teachers.

If the state does provide additional resources to support teacher professional development time, should they take the form of directly provided services, competitive grants, restricted across-the-board funds, or unrestricted across-the-board funds?

Options. If additional state funds are available to enhance the use of teacher professional development time, the state might choose to have the IDOE deliver professional development on specific topics to schools. Second, it might establish a program of competitive grants whereby schools could submit proposals to acquire specific resources; proposals would be reviewed by the IDOE and either approved or rejected by the State Board of Education. Third, the state might provide funds directly to schools but require the schools to use those funds only to support professional development on specified topics. Fourth, the state might provide funds directly to schools but impose no restriction on their use beyond that of supporting the professional development of teachers involved in local school improvement projects.

Discussion. It is important to note that this discussion focuses only on the resources that teachers need for professional development to improve local schools. There may be good reasons for the state to support professional development beyond the school improvement process, for example to acquaint school administrators and teachers with new state policies or programs or to promote changes in certification and licensing programs. This discussion does not necessarily consider which of the four options might be most appropriate for these other purposes.

Certain state-provided professional development services may be important for the success of the system of professional development time outlined in this report. Chapter 4's discussion of resources to support professional development time suggested that there are two broad categories of assistance that most schools and teachers are likely to need--assistance in starting up the process of school-oriented professional development and an infrastructure of information and resources to carry out plans for school improvement. State-provided services may be important to meeting both of these needs.

The start-up assistance that teachers and principals will probably need includes instruction and practice in:

- Applying the principles of effective professional development;
- Effective collaboration on the development of school improvement and professional development plans;
- Restructuring school time to enhance school improvement;
- Allocating and scheduling teacher time for effective work on school improvement;
- Effective collaboration on school improvement projects;
- Finding and interpreting research relevant to school improvement projects;
- Locating, observing, and assessing programs at other schools that may be relevant to school improvement projects;
- Gathering meaningful feedback on the effect of school improvement projects on student learning.

A state supportive infrastructure for school-oriented professional development might include:

- A system of computer access to education research data bases and perhaps to other professional development resources available on the Internet;
- Networks of schools involved in similar improvement projects;
- A catalog of individuals within the state who are qualified to assist schools with specific projects;
- A system for developing individuals with the expertise that is needed for school improvement but is not currently available in the state.

As the state develops strategies for providing this start-up assistance and the supportive infrastructure, it should be cognizant of the resources that may already be available. For example, the Indiana Principal Leadership Academy may have a special role to play not only in giving principals the start-up assistance noted above but also in

helping them develop the approaches to leadership described in chapter 3 as necessary to the success of school-oriented professional development.

Of course, the IDOE is likely to be asked to be the primary resource in providing the needed assistance and infrastructure. In fact, the IDOE has already begun planning for a division of professional development. Among its other plans, the IDOE might consider how current staff could be redeployed to meet the needs identified above and how current IDOE professional development activities could be redesigned to meet these needs in a way that is consistent with the principles of effective professional development.

Finally, new and revised federal programs may be of help in developing these state strategies. For example, Goals 2000 and the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provide state and local funding for professional development. As the state develops its applications for these funds, it should to the extent possible focus on meeting the start-up and infrastructure needs to support any system of teacher time for professional development that state policymakers may authorize.

Therefore, the state should seriously consider supporting services to meet these needs either through new funding or reallocation of existing resources. Of course, state services to meet these needs must be carefully designed and coordinated to ensure their quality and effectiveness for the intended purposes.

However, other types of state-provided services may be less directly relevant to the success of the system of school-oriented teacher professional development described in this report. For example, services which help teachers use particular instructional methods or teach a particular curriculum will be helpful to those schools with related school improvement projects, but they will be irrelevant to many schools in the state. The choice to use state funds for these services is less likely, therefore, to be of general benefit to teachers who are using state-supported time for school improvement. Thus, these services should be a second priority for the state.

A competitive grant system also has serious drawbacks. First, those schools that are already most adequately staffed are precisely those that are likely to have the time, energy, and expertise to write successful proposals. Thus, a competitive grant system will probably provide additional resources to schools that need them least. Moreover, competitive grants often encourage teachers to utilize pre-packaged, standardized professional development programs since those programs usually have the sort of clear purposes and procedures that can be coherently described and readily funded. However, the system of professional development time described in this report encourages teachers to identify concrete local problems and to tailor school improvement projects and professional development to those local needs. This sort of context-dependent and self-designed professional development evolves over time and is inherently risky, characteristics that do not make a project easy to fund. Thus, a competitive grant program seems to be an especially inappropriate way to support the effective use of teacher time for professional development and school improvement.

The third and fourth options, in which funds to obtain professional development resources are provided directly to schools, either with or without restrictions, do seem consistent with the system of time for teacher development described here. For they permit schools to select resources that will be particularly appropriate for their local needs. If the state has good evidence that particular uses for

those funds are likely to contribute significantly to the effectiveness of the system as a whole, it may be reasonable to restrict the uses of the funds in that way. Some of the categories of possible state services discussed above, such as helping teachers work effectively in the school improvement process, might be reflected in the restrictions. However, any specific restriction inevitably fails to meet the needs of some schools. Thus, if the state wishes to restrict the use of these funds, it should at the very least provide a wide range of alternatives among which schools can choose. And the state may wish to consider putting no restrictions on the use of these funds, particularly once schools have gotten past the initial process of working out school improvement priorities and identifying projects to meet them. For at that point, the resources needed to support teacher time should be directly focused on the specific and widely varied needs of individual schools.

Summary of the Discussion of State Policy Options

Although not all of these discussions are conclusive, they do provide a general picture of the way Indiana might enact a system of support for teacher professional development time focused on school improvement. This system might include several elements:

- A mandate that schools allocate a specific number of person-days each year per FTE teacher for school-oriented professional development, perhaps five days for schools in their PBA year or on probation and three days for other schools;
- State dedicated funding to fully support this mandate, calculated perhaps as a multiple of the average daily salary of teachers in the state;
- A requirement that schools in their PBA school improvement plan develop a written five-year strategic plan for professional development time that involves teacher participation, focuses teacher time on projects that meet the school's highest priorities for improvement, schedules time for professional development to permit effective teamwork on those projects and to maintain instructional continuity for students, provides sustained and supportive training to involved teachers, modifies projects on the basis of their effects on student learning, and explains how other resources to support the effective use of teacher time will be obtained;
- Submission of brief annual fiscal and performance reports, as part of the state-mandated report card, accounting for the use of state funds and the extent and purpose of professional development time utilized in each school;
- The provision of state start-up assistance to schools and the maintenance of state infrastructure services to support the effective use of teacher time;
- The provision of state as well as local funding to help individual schools obtain specific additional resources needed for staff development.

References

Ayers, J. B. (1989, October). *Assessing professional outcomes in professional settings: The case of teacher in-service.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association, San Francisco, CA.

Buechler, M. (1993). *Connecting learning assures successful students: A study of the CLASS program.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana Education Policy Center.

Buechler, M., & Vesper, N. (1993). *Connecting learning assures successful students: Putting CLASS in schools.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana Education Policy Center.

Calhoun, E. F. (1993, October). Action research: Three approaches. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 62-65.

Crandall, D. P. (1983, November). The teacher's role in school improvement. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 6-9.

Dillon-Peterson, B. (1990). The Lincoln experience: Development of an ecosystem. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 218-228). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. D., & Calhoun, E. F. (1991). Heaven and staff development. *Journal of Staff Development, 12*(1), 7-8.

Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Pub. L. No. 103-227, 108 Stat. 125 (1994).

Grimmett, P. P., & Crehan, E. P. (1992). The nature of collegiality in teacher development: The case of clinical supervision. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and educational change* (pp. 56-85). London: Falmer Press.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(5), 5-12.

Guskey, T. R., & Sparks, D. (1991, November). What to consider when evaluating staff development. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 73-76.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*, 227-241.

Holly, P. (1991). Action research: The missing link in the creation of schools as centers of inquiry. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development for education in the 1990s: New demands, new realities, new perspectives* (pp. 133-157). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hudson, L., Grissmer, D. W., & Kirby, S. N. (1991). *New and returning teachers in Indiana: The role of the Beginning Teacher Internship program* (Report No. R-4048-LE). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Ind. Code Ann. §§ 20-1-1.2, 20-1-1-6.3 (Burns 1992).

Indiana School Boards Association. (1994). [1993/94 ISBA data bank: Teacher contract analysis.] Unpublished raw data.

Joyce, B., Murphy, C., Showers, B., & Murphy, J. (1989, November). School renewal as cultural change. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 70-77.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982, October). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 4-10.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). *Student achievement through staff development*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Joyce, B., Showers, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1987). Staff development and student learning: A synthesis of research on models of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 11-23.

Joyce, B., Wolf, J., and Calhoun, E. (1993). *The self-renewing school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kirby, S. N., Grissmer, D. W., & Hudson, L. (1991). *New and returning teachers in Indiana: Sources of supply* (Report No. R-4049-LE). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Lieberman, A., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1992, May). Networks for educational change: Powerful and problematic. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 673-677.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal, 19,* 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15,* 129-151.

Little, J. W., Gerritz, W. H., Stern, D. S., Guthrie, J. W., Kirst, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. (1987). *Staff development in California* (PC87-12-15-CPEC). Berkeley/ San Francisco: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE); Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, S. K., Arbuckle, M. A., Murray, L. B., Dubea, C., & Williams, M. K. (1987). *Continuing to learn: A guidebook for teacher development.* Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands; National Staff Development Council.

Making staff development pay off in the classroom (Research Brief No. 4). (1991). New York: New York City Public Schools.

Marshall, J. C. (1989). Assessing program effects. In S. D. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices* (pp. 92-113). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Marshall, R., & Tucker, M. (1992). *Thinking for a living: Education and the wealth of nations.* New York: BasicBooks.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). Enabling professional development: What have we learned? In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development for education in the 1990s: New demands, new realities, new perspectives* (pp. 61-82). New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (1993). *Contexts that matter for teaching and learning: Strategic opportunities for meeting the nation's education goals.* Stanford, CA: Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

Miles, M. B. (1983, November). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 14-19.

National Education Association. (1994). *It's about time.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Education Commission on Time and Learning. (1994). *Prisoners of time.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Staff Development Council. (1994). *National Staff Development Council's standards for staff development: Middle level edition.* Oxford, OH: Author.

Orlich, D. C., Remaley, A. L., Facemyer, K. C., Logan, J., & Cao, Q. (1993). Seeking the link between student achievement and staff development. *Journal of Staff Development, 14*(3), 2-8.

Performance-Based Accreditation program manual. (1993). Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Education.

Professional development update. (1994, Fall). *Indiana Educator*, p. 5. (Available from the Indiana Department of Education, Indianapolis)

Purnell, S., & Hill, P. (1992). *Time for reform.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Raywid, M. A. (1993, September). Finding time for collaboration. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 30-34.

Schaefer, R. J. (1967). *The school as a center of inquiry.* New York: Harper & Row.

Schweitzer, R. (1994, August 12). *Instructional year 1994-95* (Memorandum). (Available from the Indiana Department of Education, Indianapolis)

Shanker, A. (1990). Staff development and the restructured school. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 91-103). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shanker, A. (1993, January 24). Where we stand: Ninety-two hours. *New York Times* (late ed.), sec. 4, p. 7.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987, November). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 77-87.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 1-22.

Sommerfeld, M. (1993, March 3). Time and space: Reformers explore new frontiers to escape the confines of 'cells and bells.' *Education Week,* pp. 13-19.

Sparks, D. (1994, March 16). A paradigm shift in staff development. *Education Week,* p. 42.

Sparks, D., and Loucks-Horsley, S. (1990). *Five models of staff development for teachers.* Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Sparks, G. M. (1983, November). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 65-72.

Sparks, G. M. (1986). The effectiveness of alternative training activities in changing teaching practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 23,* 217-225.

Sparks, G. M., & Simmons, J. M. (1989). Inquiry-oriented staff development: Using research as a source of tools, not rules. In S. D. Caldwell (Ed.), *Staff development: A handbook of effective practices* (pp. 126-139). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Stodolsky, S. S. (1988). *The subject matters: Classroom activity in math and social studies.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wade, R. K. (1984-85, December/January). What makes a difference in inservice teacher education? A meta-analysis of research. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 48-54.

Wallace, R. C., LeMahieu, P. G., & Bickel, W. E. (1990). The Pittsburgh experience: Achieving commitment to comprehensive staff development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 185-202). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Watts, G. D., & Castle, S. (1992, May). Electronic networking and the construction of professional knowledge. *Phi Delta Kappan,* pp. 684-689.

Appendix

Summaries of State-Level Professional Development Policies in Selected States

Illinois
Kentucky
Michigan
Ohio
Florida
Georgia
Washington

Illinois: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

Districts, regional superintendents acting for a group of districts, and other education cooperatives are required by state law to conduct professional development programs and to design programs for continuing education to improve teachers' skills and knowledge. Programs must serve the districts' school improvement efforts and must focus on improving student learning. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) approves the professional development programs and provides funds for that purpose (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/2-3.59, .60). Additional funding for schools is available through several competitive grants programs that support planning and other professional development processes. Under Illinois law, professional development is broadly defined; specific activities sanctioned include demonstration of methods of teaching, visitation of facilities, and seminars on sexual abuse or assault awareness (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/3-11).

Illinois requires teachers, counselors, and other professionals in grades 7-12 to be trained to identify suicidal behavior in adolescents and teens and to learn how to intervene appropriately (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/10-22.39, 5/34-18.7). The state encourages, but does not require, school personnel to have inservice training on AIDS and AIDS awareness, with training standards set by the ISBE and the Department of Public Health (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/10-22.39, 5/34-18.8).

Teacher Time

In nearly all counties (Cook County-Chicago is treated somewhat differently), regional superintendents may arrange for, or themselves conduct, a maximum of four days annually for professional development activities. Up to two days may be teacher workshops or institutes, up to two may be parent-teacher conferences, and up to two may be parental institutes, which are designed to encourage parent and guardian involvement and communication with the schools (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/3-11; 5/10-22.18d).

Implementation

Illinois' delivery system includes 18 regional Educational Service Centers (ESCs), as well as 56 popularly elected regional superintendents. The ESCs are the main vehicle for delivering professional development services to schools (Sue Bentz, Illinois Department of Education, personal communication, July 18, 1994). They receive state funding and are eligible for both federal and state grants. With these monies, they serve as brokering agents to districts and consortia to provide professional development seminars directly, contract with outside agents for professional development, and facilitate communication with and reporting to the ISBE. ESCs were created in the mid-1980s specifically to deliver these kinds of services to local education bodies (Joy Russell, ESC No. 15, personal communication, October 28, 1994).

The regional superintendents' offices, while more regulatory in nature, also assist with professional development. They collect examination, registration, and renewal fees and use those funds to sponsor institutes and workshops for teachers and other professionals (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/3-12). Committees composed of teachers, administrators, and other school personnel advise the regional superintendents on content, scheduling, and funding of professional development activities. Plans are to decrease the number of regional superintendents from 56 to 35 by the year 2000 (Tom Kerins, ISBE, personal communication, September 30, 1994).

Beginning in 1995, ESCs and the regional superintendents' offices will be merged into Regional Offices of Education, each with an elected superintendent and an oversight board consisting of selected parents, teachers, and administrators. Board members will be selected by various constituent groups; for example, teacher groups will select teacher representatives to serve on these boards (Tom Kerins, ISBE, personal communication, September 30, 1994).

ESCs provide professional development services to districts or consortia in part through a Retired Professional Service Corps (RPSC). Consisting of experienced educators who have been trained and have demonstrated expertise (often subsequent to early retirement), the RPSC serves as a cadre of consultants (Tom Kerins, ISBE, personal communication, September 30, 1994). The RPSC also assists schools in developing school improvement plans, in financial planning, and in other ways.

Funding

An Institute Fund is used to support much of the professional development activity in Illinois. Regional superintendents, subject to the approval of an oversight board, use the Fund to defray expenses related to institutes, workshops, or other professional development meetings. As mentioned, the fund is derived from examination, registration, and renewal fees generated in that region (*Ill. Ann. Stat.* ch. 105, para. 5/3-12).

The legislature appropriates funds used by the ISBE to assist districts and regions in carrying out their professional development plans. According to the ISBE, some $4 million has been appropriated, and disbursed on a formula basis, for each of the past two years. Actually, in 1994-95, that amount was increased to $12 million, but a line item veto exercised by the Governor has made disbursement of the additional funds contingent upon legislative action in the next session (Tom Kerins, ISBE, personal communication, September 30, 1994)

The ESCs receive about $10 million annually. They receive approximately $350,000 from the ISBE to pay for RPSC services (Tom Kerins, ISBE, personal communication, September 30, 1994). The rest comes from state funding and state and federal grants.

Another $15 million in fiscal year (FY) 1995 was allocated to schools through Illinois' competitive grants programs: $6 million for science literacy professional development and science literacy pilot projects, $4.5 million for School Improvement Change Grants, and $4.5 million for the State Education Drug Initiative (ISBE, 1994). About half of the 1,083 proposals submitted by schools and districts for the school improvement grants were funded, as were 114 projects under the State Education Drug Initiative (Myron Mason, ISBE, personal communication, October 24, 1994).

Kentucky: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

Kentucky requires schools, districts, and consortia--clusters of districts required for all districts having fewer than 20,000 students--to develop and submit annual professional development plans to the Kentucky Department of Education (KDOE). At all levels, these plans must facilitate the implementation of the 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (*1990 Ky. Acts* ch. 476), or KERA, an omnibus reform bill that established a new education funding system, mandatory site-based management at all schools, performance outcomes for all students, a statewide performance assessment system, performance-based awards and sanctions for all schools, ungraded instruction through third grade, and a statewide professional development system, among other reforms.

In implementing KERA, schools, districts, and consortia of districts each create plans that are nested, with each higher administrative level providing feedback to the level below, aggregating the plans received, and incorporating into its own plan the training and resource coordination needs of the lower level plans. Responsibilities for the plans for each level are set forth by the KDOE (*Professional Development Planning*, 1994):

- School-level plans must focus on teachers' ability to enhance student performance.
- District-level plans must manage individual school plans and provide a direction for all professional development plans in the district.
- Consortia exist in part to offer professional development to member districts that is too expensive for individual districts to acquire. Their efforts focus on building the capacity of district staff to carry on KERA initiatives.

All professional development plans are evaluated according to seven criteria (*Professional Development Planning*, 1994). Plans must:

- Focus on the components of KERA;
- Be developed through active participation and input at each level;
- Give attention to professional growth needs at different stages of development with respect to KERA goals (i.e., orientation, preparation, implementation, impact);
- Provide sufficient opportunities for professional growth in designated KERA goals throughout the school year;
- Provide professional development activities that directly address the needs identified in the needs assessment;
- Describe standards and a process that ensure the delivery of high quality professional development sessions/experiences/activities;
- Describe a structure and process for evaluating professional development activities and making improvements in the professional development program.

Teachers are required to create an individual Professional Growth Plan, which must be aligned with their school and/or district professional development goals (*704 Ky. Admin. Regs.* 3:345). These plans are reviewed annually and are usually tied to teachers' evaluation cycle. Tenured teachers must be evaluated at least once every three years; other teachers are evaluated annually.

Teacher Time

Four days of professional development and planning for professional staff are mandated for each district. Five additional days, taken from the mandated instructional year, are available for professional development; this option is limited to the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years (*Kentucky SB 162*, 1994). Currently, districts typically use two or three of these additional days, with requests for half-days becoming common (Bob Trahan, KDOE, personal communication, July 22, 1994).

Implementation

KERA required the KDOE, during the transition years of 1991 and 1992, to provide a series of professional development programs focusing on the new education reform act itself and related topics, such as school-based decision making, performance-based assessment, instructional uses of technology, and awareness of students of diverse cultures (*Education Reform in Kentucky*, n.d.). These sessions evolved into an "integrated professional development series" based on KERA components, such as curriculum frameworks, performance assessments, and instructional strategies. This series was developed and is delivered through the joint efforts of the KDOE, institutions of higher education, and the Regional Service Centers, or RSCs (*Professional Development Planning*, 1994). Districts or consortia can arrange to use the series in their own locally designed professional development plans.

The state provides several services to assist with the implementation of professional development initiatives. Eight RSCs provide technical services to school districts. The centers are responsible for the coordination of professional development in the districts they represent. They broker services already available through cooperatives or consortia or provide services directly. Services include, but are not limited to: technology, curriculum and assessment, site-based decision making, writing resources, and extended school services. RSC staff, often specialists in a content area, may be hired on "loan" from a local district, or may be hired at large. In the former case, a contract guarantees the individual's place in the district should he or she decide to return after a specified period of time. RSC staff are paid by the KDOE.

A second form of state assistance involves state sponsorship of three types of experts: KERA Fellows, distinguished educators, and Math and Reading Cluster Leaders. KERA Fellows are teachers who volunteer to receive training related to components of the KERA. They stay in their districts, forming a cadre of highly skilled and trained teachers who act as a professional development resource. Distinguished educators are highly skilled certified personnel who are given two years of release time to become resource persons for the KDOE. They are trained for one year and spend the second year in a technical assistant role. They may, among other

things, work on design and implementation of some aspect of KERA or serve as a professional development trainer for districts that request assistance. After the two year period, these individuals may return to their prior position or assume another. The Math and Reading Cluster Leaders were trained under PRISM, a $9.7 million National Science Foundation grant, to help teachers improve their skills in teaching science, mathematics, and technology in the middle grades. Teachers who participate in the program are expected to serve as a professional development resource for their schools and districts (Tibbals, 1993).

To assist in the delivery and coordination of local professional development, district superintendents must appoint one certified employee as professional development coordinator, sometimes a current instructional supervisor or assistant superintendent. The State Board of Education provides an annual training program for the coordinators in areas such as needs assessment, options for meeting professional development needs, and methods of involving teachers and administrators in planning and delivering programs (*Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann.* § 156.095). Trained in KERA components, the coordinators assist local schools in planning and implementation, as well as provide or arrange for district-wide professional development.

Summer institutes for teachers are one-week intensive seminars designed to provide already effective teachers with the opportunity to further hone their skills and knowledge (*Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann.* § 156.097). The institutes, held at institutions of higher education, offer focused training sessions on a theme that changes annually. For 1994-1995 the focus is on gifted and talented programs. Districts and consortia may also offer three- to five-day summer retreats. The KDOE reported that about half of the districts do not spend their allotment of funds during the school year and thus can support additional activities during the summer (Bob Trahan, KDOE, personal communication, July 22, 1994).

Funding

General funding from the legislature is distributed according to average daily attendance (ADA). This amount has increased from $1.00/ADA in 1990 to $18.00/ADA for the 1994-95 year. New legislation requires that 65% of that total be allocated from the district to the school. The remainder, for now, goes to consortia (*Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann.* § 156.0951; *Kentucky HB 211*, 1994). Consortia will soon be voluntary, so funds may be distributed differently.

Michigan: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

In December 1993, legislation was passed in Michigan eliminating categorical statewide professional development programs. Professional development in Michigan is now a required component of comprehensive school improvement plans. These plans are designed at both the level of the district to meet local needs and at the level of the intermediate district (a consortium of local districts) to meet the needs of constituent districts. School improvement plans are mandatory and are updated every three to five years (*Mich. Comp. Laws Ann.* § 380.1277).

The state provides funds to cultivate long-term sustained and coached professional development efforts in the following six areas (*Mich. Comp. Laws Ann.* § 380.1525):

- Improvement of teaching and pupils' learning of academic core curriculum;
- Collaborative decision making;
- Site-based management;
- The process of school improvement;
- Instructional leadership;
- The use of data and assessment instruments to improve teaching and learning.

Teacher Time

Although professional development is a required component of school improvement plans, no inservice days are mandated by the state for experienced teachers.

Implementation

Within legislative guidelines, the Michigan State Board of Education (MSBE) has established the following criteria for funding professional development programs at the intermediate district level (Shiller, 1994a):

- Resources must be aligned to assist local districts in implementing their professional development plans.
- Professional development plans must address efficiency, effectiveness and access for all.
- Measures must be developed to document increased delivery of authentic teaching and learning strategies among local districts.

The MSBE has also established three funding criteria for plans at the local district level (Shiller, 1994b):

- Professional development needs of members of the learning community must be clearly identified and defined.

- Resources must be aligned to deliver sustained professional development experiences.
- Measures must be developed to document increased delivery of authentic teaching and learning strategies at the district level.

Funding

Funds are appropriated for professional development by the state legislature and, subject to the approval of the MSBE, are made available through entitlement funding administered by the Michigan Department of Education (MDOE) in the following manner: 65% goes to local school districts for local professional development programs, 15% goes to intermediate school districts to fund programs at that level, and 20% goes to the MDOE to fund statewide professional development initiatives that will be available on a competitive basis to applicants (*Mich. Comp. Laws Ann.* § 380.1525). Award recipients will work with the MSBE and MDOE staff to plan, develop, and implement a biennial education policy leadership institute, a statewide academy for school leadership, a community leadership development program, and a program to promote high educational standards (Kathleen Mayhew, MDOE, personal communication, November 4, 1994).

Professional development funds totalling $10 million have been allocated for the 1994-95 school year for teachers, administrators, and others in the education community. The funding is distributed on an equal-amount-per-pupil basis to local and intermediate districts (*Mich. Comp. Laws Ann.* § 388.1695).

Ohio: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

Ohio has used a variety of approaches to professional development for teachers. Recently, a "venture capital" plan has been instituted to provide competitive grants of $25,000 to districts. The grants, awarded by the Ohio State Board of Education, are intended to encourage reform efforts such as those championed by Ted Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools or Henry Levin's Accelerated Schools (Nancy Eberhart, Ohio Department of Education [ODOE], personal communication, July 20, 1994; *Ohio's Commitment*, 1993).

Ohio authorizes local boards of education to establish professional development programs and reimburse teachers for all or part of their expenses. However, teachers cannot be required to participate in these locally developed professional development programs (*Ohio Rev. Code Ann.* § 3319.071).

The state requires local boards of education to conduct professional development on certain topics. For example, every local board must provide inservice workshops or training for professional staff on child abuse prevention. Four hours of instruction must be delivered within 3 years (*Ohio Rev. Code Ann.* § 3319.073).

Teacher Time

Up to two days of the regular school year of 182 days may be used for "professional meetings" of teachers; districts have discretion as to how to use them (*Ohio Rev. Code Ann.* § 3313.48).

Implementation

A recently established Professional Development work cluster within the ODOE employs over 35 full-time staff to provide professional development to support the connection between teaching and learning (Nancy Eberhart, ODOE, personal communication, November 1, 1994).

A system of Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC) has been established to facilitate professional development in the districts they represent. The RPDCs evolved from earlier Regional Councils that provided inservice education. The new centers coordinate and facilitate the sharing of successful education practices among districts. RPDCs assist with school improvement and with the implementation of site-based decision making plans (*Removing the Barriers*, 1992).

The RPDCs also assist districts with the venture capital grants process. They help prepare applications and conduct peer reviews and interviews, by means of which applications are ranked. Slightly over 300 schools received grants for FY 1994; approximately 40 additional grants will be available for FY 1995 (Nancy Eberhart, ODOE, personal communication, July 20, 1994; Richard Googins, ODOE, personal communication, October 24, 1994).

Funding

Total funding for the eight RPDCs is around $8 million per biennium. Their funding reduced the amount of professional development money going directly to districts, a matter of concern in some districts (Nancy Eberhart, ODOE, personal communication, July 20, 1994).

The venture capital plan is funded at $15 million for the 1993-95 biennium (Nancy Eberhart, ODOE, personal communication, July 20, 1994).

Florida: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

Since 1986, Florida has required each school board to develop and approve a five-year master plan (updated annually) for inservice education. The plan must be based on an assessment of local inservice training needs by a committee consisting of parents, teachers, and other educational personnel (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 236.0811).

In 1992, Florida developed a plan, Blueprint 2000: A System of School Improvement and Accountability (Florida Commission, 1992), in response to the National Education Goals. All school districts must have a school improvement plan that meets the criteria in Blueprint 2000. Districts are required to use these plans to determine their professional development needs. The state also requires there to be certain professional development components in each school improvement plan. For instance, all teachers and guidance counselors must participate in inservice training in instruction for exceptional students, child abuse/neglect prevention, alcohol and substance abuse prevention, and multicultural sensitivity education, which may include negotiation and conflict resolution training (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 236.0811).

The district plan must include components that teachers can use for the renewal of a certificate or a new endorsement targeting the middle grades in areas such as curriculum development and improvement of critical thinking (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 236.0811). Moreover, the plan must contain a comprehensive health education and substance abuse prevention program to promote the establishment of sound nutrition and health, sexually transmitted disease prevention, and sexual abstinence. To facilitate implementation of this component, the state requires inservice instruction to train existing faculty members to be health education instructors (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 233.067).

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) is responsible for the development of an inservice master plan for updating the professional and technical knowledge of vocational educators (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 231.614).

Florida implemented the Teachers as Advisers Act (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 230.2314) in 1984-85 to increase the amount of academic and career advisement to which secondary students have access through the use of classroom teachers in an advisory role. Professional development for the Teachers as Advisers program is delivered through summer institutes; participation in these institutes is voluntary.

Teacher Time

Florida has mandated that classroom teachers be provided five days of inservice training within the 196-day contract year; these inservice days cannot occur on days students are in attendance (*1994 Florida Legislative Appropriations Act*, Specific Appropriation 528). They need not be scheduled together or even as complete days (J. Williams, FDOE, personal communication, July 22, 1994). Eleven other non-instructional days may also be used for professional development.

Implementation

Each district has a professional development office. In addition, Florida allows individual districts or consortia of districts to establish and maintain teacher education centers (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 231.603). If a district has a teacher education center (TEC), the TEC and professional development office are one and the same (J. Williams, FDOE, personal communication, July 22, 1994). The program at each TEC includes assessment of inservice training needs of instructional personnel and the development and implementation of programs based on identified needs. Their role emphasizes teacher training, but they also provide training for non-instructional personnel (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 231.603).

Florida has established a Prevention Resource Center within the FDOE to serve as a clearinghouse of model programs, information, and materials for school district personnel providing local health education and substance abuse prevention programs (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 231.067). In addition to this clearinghouse, the FDOE sponsors the League of Teachers, a network program that brings together groups of outstanding teachers from across the state to learn about new education strategies and practices that they can share with their colleagues. The primary purpose of this network is to assist teachers in improving classroom instruction to attain the goals set forth in Blueprint 2000. The state also sponsors the Florida Academy for Excellence in Teaching, a collaborative effort of the FDOE and selected school districts and universities. Member academies provide professional development to teachers on innovative, research-based instructional strategies and practices. With university faculty providing ongoing coaching and mentoring, teachers are encouraged to use these strategies and practices in their classrooms and to share them with colleagues (Jean Williams, FDOE, personal communication, November 3, 1994).

Funding

Districts are required to spend a percentage of their base student allocation for professional development each year (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 236.081[1][s]). The required inservice expenditure for 1994-95 is about 0.23% or $5.88 per pupil (Jean Williams, FDOE, personal communication, November 3, 1994). Two thirds of these dollars must be spent to fund the TEC, if there is one, and provide a professional orientation program for new teachers (*Fla. Stat. Ann.* § 236.081[3]).

Each year additional funding is provided for summer inservice institutes. For 1994-95, $8.6 million has been allocated for these institutes and other training for implementing Blueprint 2000 initiatives (*1994 Florida Legislative Appropriations Act*, Specific Appropriation 439).

The five days of inservice training must be provided from the state funding to districts and/or from local district funds (*1994 Florida Legislative Appropriations Act*, Specific Appropriation 528).

Georgia: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

Georgia's Quality Basic Education Act (*Ga. Code Ann.* §§ 20-2-130 to -322.1), adopted in 1985, requires school systems to provide professional development training to all school personnel, including local boards of education, certified staff, and non-certified staff (*Staff Development Services*, n.d).

Local school systems must appoint a professional development coordinator and establish a professional development advisory committee (*Ga. Comp. R. & Regs.* r. 160-3-3-.04[2][a]). In addition, local systems must develop an annual comprehensive professional development plan and submit their plans to the Georgia Department of Education (GDOE) for review and approval. Professional development plans must address needs identified through personnel and program evaluations and needs perceived by the school system or the GDOE (*Ga. Comp. R. & Regs.* r. 160-3-3-.04[2][b]).

Each school district is encouraged to cooperate with the Georgia Education Leadership Academy (established to provide professional development to school leaders), institutions of higher education, the GDOE, and regional educational service agencies (RESAs) to develop and implement effective professional development programs to meet the needs of professionals in the education system (*Ga. Code Ann.* § 20-2-232).

Teacher Time

The state-mandated school calendar provides for 10 non-instructional days that may be used for professional development (*Ga. Comp. R. & Regs.* r. 160-5-1-.01; Amy McMurty, GDOE, personal communication, August 2, 1994). State funds used for professional development purposes may be utilized at any time during the fiscal year, including days when students are not in school (*Ga. Code Ann.* § 20-2-182).

Implementation

RESAs are set up by the Georgia State Board of Education (GSBE) to provide shared services to all school districts in a specific geographical area. These services include the development and implementation of professional development programs (*Ga. Code Ann.* § 20-2-270).

The GDOE, in cooperation with other state and local organizations, sponsors an annual Human Resource Development Expo to provide opportunities for personnel affiliated with local school systems, RESAs, and institutions of higher education to learn about services, products, and programs available for professional development (*Staff Development Services*, n.d.).

Funding

Annually, the GSBE computes the amount each district shall spend for professional development for certified and classified personnel, local school board members, and for school personnel to meet certification requirements. These funds, called Cost of Instruction (COI) funds, are calculated at 0.5% of the salaries of certified personnel in the district (*Georgia Staff Development Programs*, n.d.). Each district must spend at least the calculated amount for professional development activities (*Ga. Code Ann.* § 20-2-167).

COI funds are used to pay for professional development for school board members, teachers in the induction stage, and experienced teachers. COI funds may be used for:

- Release time for teachers to participate in professional development activities (substitute teachers' salaries);
- Travel to conferences and workshops;
- Professional, technical, instructional, or consulting services.

COI funds available for the 1994 fiscal year are nearly $6.4 million (G. Oswood, GDOE, personal communication, August 3, 1994).

Georgia also provides Professional Development Stipends (PDS) to allow eligible personnel to participate in professional development activities outside their normal contract time. Stipends are $150 per credit hour and pay for 1 to 15 quarter hours (up to 9 semester hours) per year. Each person who receives a PDS must complete an approved activity (college credit course or approved professional development course) and render at least one month's service in a Georgia public school district. (This requirement exists to ensure that the training received from PDS funds benefit Georgia's public schools.) PDS funds are used to address assessed professional development needs and cannot be used for the primary purpose of obtaining an advanced degree (*Georgia Staff Development Programs*, n.d.). PDS funds appropriated for the 1994 fiscal year amount to nearly $22 million (G. Oswood, GDOE, personal communication, August 3, 1994).

Washington: State Professional Development Policies

Basic Policies

Local districts are required to establish a professional development program for certified classroom teachers and support personnel unless a collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise, and to form a professional development committee to develop the program. The committee was to be in place by the 1990-91 school year, and the professional growth program started by the 1992-93 school year (*Wash. Admin. Code* §§ 392-192-030 to -070).

In 1993, a new comprehensive Education Reform Act (*1993 Wash. Laws, ch. 336*) was passed. It set forth four learning goals for the state's schools and students. A Commission on Student Learning (CSL) was established to identify skills and knowledge that all students need and to develop a "strong and varied" performance-based student assessment system. The CSL has noted that for students to be fairly held accountable to performance standards, they must have access to more meaningful learning environments, which will require "more relevant and effective teacher education programs and inservice training systems for all educators" (*Washington Commission*, 1994, p. 6).

Another facet of the Education Reform Act (Part III) was the initiation of a Student Learning Improvement Grant (SLIG) program. The purpose of these grants is "to provide funds for additional time and resources for professional development and planning intended to improve student learning for all students" (*Wash. Rev. Code Ann.* § 28A.300.138).

A Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) was also created within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Its responsibilities include serving as a clearinghouse for the CSL's work and providing best practice research and advice to help schools develop and implement, among other things, school improvement plans and programs that will assist educators in helping students master the essential academic learning requirements (*Center for the Improvement*, n.d.).

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, Educational Service Districts (ESDs), and local districts are encouraged to train teachers to show children how to resist and report child abuse (*Wash. Rev. Code Ann.* § 28A.415.050).

Teacher Time

No inservice days are mandated by the state. The number of professional development days available for years 1994-95 through 1996-97, through SLIG money, is no more than four, depending on demand (*1994 Wash. Laws* Engrossed Substitute HB 2850). However, many local districts do offer inservice days beyond the minimum required student contact days (Alf Langland, Washington Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, November 2, 1994).

Implementation

The CSL holds an annual capacity-building conference, one week in duration, which attracts representatives from over 200 local districts (Alf Langland, Washington Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, November 2, 1994).

Each of Washington's ESDs maintains a Professional Development Center. These centers receive a small and dwindling subsidy from the legislature, and otherwise are entrepreneurial, working with districts to form cooperatives, or serving as fiscal agents for a consortia of districts applying for state grants, for example (*Wash. Rev. Code Ann.* § 28A.415.010; David Moberly, Washington Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, October 25, 1994).

SLIGs provide funds for professional development and planning time in addition to the regular school contract. SLIG proposals must specify professional development and planning activities, as well as a projected budget. According to Marillee Jensen of the CISL (personal communication, July 12, 1994), 1,800 schools submitted proposals for 1994-95, all of which were approved and funded. The duration of subsidized time per grant, for the period 1994-95 through 1996-97, was set by the legislature at "up to four days" in an amendment to the Reform Bill (*1994 Wash. Laws* Engrossed Substitute HB 2850). However, the 1995 legislature will determine the level of funding for the 1995-97 biennium. Programs can take place during the school year or during July or August preceding the year of the grant.

Funding

Funding for 1994-95 SLIGs is $760 per building-based FTE certified faculty member, which totals nearly $40 million (Alf Langland, Washington Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, November 2, 1994).

In addition to small state subsidies, ESDs retain one half of all certification fee money. The funds, which combined total approximately $300,000, must be used for model or innovative professional development programs in that ESD (Alf Langland, Washington Department of Public Instruction, personal communication, November 2, 1994).

Appendix References

704 Ky. Admin. Regs. 3:345 (1993).

1990 Ky. Acts ch. 476.

1994 Florida Legislative Appropriations Act (Specific Appropriation 439, 528)

1994 Wash. Laws (Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2850).

Center for the improvement of student learning (n.d.). Olympia, WA: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Education reform in Kentucky: A new beginning (n.d.). Frankfort: Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability. (1992). *Blueprint 2000: A system of school improvement and accountability.* Tallahassee: Author.

Fla. Stat. Ann. §§ 230.2314; 231.603; 236.081; 236.0811 (West Supp. 1994).

Fla. Stat. Ann. §§ 231.067, .614; 233.067 (West 1989).

Ga. Code Ann. §§ 20-2-130 to -322.1; 20-2-232, -270 (Michie 1992).

Ga. Code Ann. §§ 20-2-167, -182 (Michie Supp. 1994).

Ga. Comp. R. & Regs. r. 160-3-3-.04, -5-1-.01 (1994).

Georgia staff development programs fiscal year 1993. (n.d.). Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education.

Ill. Ann. Stat. ch. 105, para. 5/2-3.59, .60; ch. 105, para. 5/10-22.18, .39; ch. 105, para. 5/34-18.7, 18.8 (Smith-Hurd 1993).

Ill. Ann. Stat. ch. 105, para. 5/3-11, -12 (Smith-Hurd Supp. 1994).

Illinois State Board of Education. (1994, September). *Department of school improvement and instruction newsletter, 1*(2).

Kentucky House Bill 211 (1994).

Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 156.095, .0951, .097 (Michie/Bobbs-Merrill 1992).

Kentucky Senate Bill 162 (1994).

Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. §§ 380.1277, .1525; 388.1695 (West Supp. 1994).

Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 3313.48; 3319.071, .073 (Anderson, 1990).

Ohio's commitment to school renewal. (1993, July). Columbus: Ohio Department of Education.

Professional development planning process, 1994-1995. (1994, May). Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education.

Removing the barriers: Unleashing Ohio's learning power (Draft). (1992, December). Columbus: Ohio Department of Education.

Shiller, R. E. (1994a, May 4). *Application materials for school improvement/ professional development funding to intermediate school district superintendents* (Memorandum, Attachment A). (Available from the Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, MI)

Shiller, R. E. (1994b, May 4). *Application materials for school improvement/ professional development funding to local school district superintendents* (Memorandum, Attachment A). (Available from the Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, MI)

Staff development services (Information Packet). (n.d.). Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education, Human Resource Services.

Tibbals, C. (1993, June-July). PRISM: Shining some light on middle school mathematics. *Kentucky Teacher*, pp. 6-7. (Available from the Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort)

Wash. Admin. Code §§ 392-192-030 to -070 (1991).

Washington Commission on Student Learning. (1994, March). *High standards: Essential learnings for Washington students* (draft). Olympia: Author.

Wash. Rev. Code Ann. §§ 28A.300.138; 28A.415.010, .050 (West Supp. 1994).